

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT
ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES**

APPROVED Journal of Proceedings – September 5, 2012

Speaker BERGSTROM: Good afternoon. Welcome to the Wednesday, September 5 session of the Cape Cod Regional Government, Assembly of Delegates.

I'll call this meeting to order, and we will begin with a moment of silence to honor our troops who have died in service to our country and all those serving our country in the Armed Forces.

(Moment of silence.)

Now we'll stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

The Clerk will call the roll.

**Roll Call (95.45%): 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), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Spyro Mitrokostas (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Paul Pilcher (1.27% - Wellfleet), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), , Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).
Absent (4.55%): Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster).**

Clerk OCONNELL: Mr. Speaker, we have a quorum present with 95.45 percent of the Delegates present and 4.55 percent absent.

Committee of the Whole

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you.

I'll now need a motion to Approve today's Calendar of Business.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Motion to Approve the Calendar of Business.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Moved and seconded. There are no additions or corrections. All those in favor of approval of the Calendar of Business, say "aye."

Speaker BERGSTROM: Opposed? (Motion carries).

Okay. You should have received a copy of the Journal of August 15, 2012. Are there any additions or corrections to the Journal?

Hearing none. I need a Motion to Approve.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Motion to Approve the Journal of August 15.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Moved and seconded. All those in favor say "aye."
Opposed?

Ms. MC CUTCHEON: Abstained.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And one abstained. (Motion carries).

Okay. We now have Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners, and I see the Chair of the Commissioners here presenting us with a Resolution.

Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners

Commissioner FLYNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon, everyone. What I gave you was the request for transfers for the AmeriCorps account. Each year we budget a certain amount of money, and then when we know which accounts that we are expecting to fund for the year, we ask that you transfer the appropriate amount of dollars in the larger sum of 43,000-something into those accounts. So that's all that is.

Today, we actually voted a Proclamation declaring next week, September 9 through the 15, as Suicide Prevention Week. As you probably know, our Human Services Department, under the leadership of Beth Albert, has been working specifically in the last two years to really help the coalition move forward with some of its objectives in terms of reaching people with depression and other issues that sometimes cause people to take their own lives.

The suicide rate on the Cape is higher than any other city or town in the Commonwealth and the Coalition has worked very hard to try to reach out and do a lot of work in education and prevention.

So, next week is the week in which they are going to continue that effort under the direction of Maura Weir. And they made us an excellent presentation today, and we certainly support the work they have done. And they're meeting next week, which is next Thursday, I think from 11:15 to 12:45, and they meet in the Harborview Room. And they will continue to reach out to people who really are in need.

We also met with a group, a couple of volunteers; one from the Town of Orleans, from the Health Department in Orleans, and one who works in the Health Department here in the County, on giving us an update on the Hoarder Task Force.

Some of you may have seen some reality shows about people who hoard and the consequences, the huge consequence it has for people both physically, mentally, socially to be completely enveloped by things. And they have a very great difficulty in allowing themselves to dispose or to transfer or to give away or whatever it is, excess possessions that they might have.

So this group has been working very hard; they're a volunteer group. They really don't have any money, but they're doing a lot of work in the community to try to raise awareness for people who do somehow have that obsession to want to hoard.

And -- I shouldn't say this -- but, anyway, I'm not going to say anything. But, anyway, they're doing really good work, and they do need to raise awareness, particularly as a resource to people.

I had that happen to me about four or five years ago when someone called me and said, "I have a friend who has a real serious problem in hoarding, and I don't know what to do about it." Well, I didn't know what to do about it either. I didn't know what resources were available or what could be done.

So we got together; we worked with our Board of Health; we worked with our Town Counsel, and we came up with a plan to help this woman certainly by reaching out to her next of kin, who was extremely helpful in helping us help her, dispose of a lot of things that she had accumulated and just simply, for whatever reason, could not dispose of.

So, it is a serious problem. It's a problem here on the Cape. We have some people who are working actively to help in that.

The last issue we took up today, and you received a copy of it, is a letter from the Sandwich Board of Selectmen regarding the wastewater planning in Sandwich. They wanted to let us know what they've been doing over the last few years, the efforts that they have made, and it was an extremely well-written and thoroughly complete and documented story, if you will, of how Sandwich is dealing

with the wastewater issues. And we felt as Commissioners that we need to acknowledge the effort that the Board of Selectmen made in putting that document together.

So we discussed it today, and Frank Pannorfi, from the Board of Selectmen was there; Linell Grundman, so we had two Sandwich Selectmen this afternoon in the discussion. And it was very, very helpful to us because it gave the Commissioners a picture of how another community has been working to resolve its wastewater issues. What it can do on its own; where it needs help; where the County might be able to help, and helping is not creating a taxing authority, which I think I said before, but I need to repeat that that is not an option.

But they were concerned because they've heard a lot of rumblings and e-mails and stories about having a MWRA for Cape Cod.

But I think we -- it was a very good discussion, and they told us some the things that they faced, and how they had to work through the issues, and how much money they've had to spend as a community to do the kind of planning that you have to do if you want to have a wastewater plant that's really going to work.

And so they looked to us for ways in which the County or the Collaborative could be more helpful to them. And, obviously, one way is funding, and we don't know yet how that will actually work out. That would obviously require some kind of legislation in some way, shape, or form.

But we're not there yet, but at least we're learning what other communities are doing and they're learning from each other too, and that's a good thing, and that's what this is all about.

So, we were very grateful that they took the time to be so thorough in writing us this letter and giving us a real insight into the difficulties that communities are facing in dealing with their wastewater issues.

That's my report.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you. Any questions for the Board for Commissioner Flynn?

Commissioner FLYNN: If anybody didn't get the letter, I have some extra copies here if you'd like.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yeah. Mary Pat, have you done anything else on the recommendations of not only of the Special Commission on County Governance, but also the Task Force that you employed to look at County Government before that? I can't think of the name of it now, but I mean you had some recommendations on the table. Have you organized any -- I mean you were going to look at how these could be implemented and who would have to do what. Have you gone any further on that?

Commissioner FLYNN: We have a plan, but we're not going to do any more execution of that until after November 6, because I think it's important to -- I mean, we could work on it, but, obviously, there are going to be two people elected, and one of us will stay, and it's possible that one of us may not stay and there may be a new member. And we think that since there are only three of us that it makes more sense since we have the plan in place that before we begin any further discussions or execution of anything that we wait until after the election.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Yes, Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: Mary Pat, your comments with regard to the Sandwich Board of Selectmen from my perspective really had an awful lot to do with communication. And listening to you reminded me of an issue I think maybe you were at the table when I asked it, which was if the Board of Regional Commissioners issues a Press Release, is that Press Release getting copied to the Assembly of Delegates? And I think the answer was we weren't sure but we will.

And a follow-up to that would be I don't think I've seen any since I raised that issue. So, does that mean there have been no Press Releases from the County Commissioners?

Commissioner FLYNN: It means yes, there have not been, but it doesn't mean that we have set the issue aside.

In fact, we have had discussions with Paul Niedzwiecki at the Cape Cod Commission because we feel that communication and how we communicate even though the Commission is the department within the County, and Paul Niedzwiecki reports to the Commissioners. They seemed to be able to do a little better at communicating than we do, and we want this to be a County effort, not just a Commission effort or a County Commission effort.

But that is our goal for this coming year to develop a communication plan for the County that includes the Commission, it includes all the departments, so that we have a formalized process on how we send information out into the community and not just in response but rather in a more proactive way. So, yes, it is in the planning.

Ms. ANDREWS: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Is Paul still on schedule to deliver a report on the County's efforts on wastewater? He was originally asked to do that by January 1, I think you said?

COMMISSIONER FLYNN: December. We asked him to move it back to October.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Moved it back to like next month?

Commissioner FLYNN: Uh-huh. Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. All right.

Commissioner FLYNN: Move it up rather, not back.

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

Commissioner FLYNN: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Now we have Communications from County Administrator Mark Zielinski on the Barnstable County Retirement Association.

Communications from County Administrator Mark Zielinski on Barnstable County Retirement System

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And today I am wearing my hat as Chairman of the Barnstable County Retirement Association. And I have a presentation. Maybe we need to kill half the lights or something? Is that all right? Can everybody see that? I think it's a little out of focus.

And this is a presentation that I give periodically, and I've done it to a few Boards of Selectmen. My fellow Board members have been on Nantucket giving it to them. They're a member of the system.

So, what I'm going to talk about today is just give you an overview of the overall Massachusetts system and the 106 members there.

I'm going to talk a little bit about the Barnstable County system and give an overview of our system and our investment performance as of 6/30.

And then I'm going to delve briefly into the most recent pension reform, which is Chapter 176 of the Acts of 2011. And there are some changes in there that impact existing members of the system and then new members after April 2. So, I'll go into those.

As you know, there are 105 contributory retirement systems in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Barnstable County Retirement System is a regional system. We have 51 members -- units in our system. All the towns on Cape Cod except the Town of Falmouth are in our system. The water districts, fire districts, school districts those types of things. Falmouth is there own system. They're one of those 105.

The retirement systems are governed by Chapter 32 of the General Laws. It provides the

statutory framework for administering the retirement plan. The retirement systems at the local level are administered by boards consisting of five members, and I'll talk about whose on the local board in just a second.

And then our oversight agency of the state is PERAC. That's the Public Employees Retirement Administration Commission. You hear about them frequently in the newspaper.

You probably all know this but prior to 1988, you know that retirement appropriations were on a pay-as-you-go basis, just like health insurance is right now as OPEB, as you hear that word, benefits are as well. They're pay-as-you-go.

But in 1988 and 1987, they went through a pension reform which required systems to become fully funded within 40 years. And back then, that was at 2028. Subsequent reforms over the past few years have extended that deadline to 2040. But now you have to become fully funded.

So, what we're in now is a period and a process where we pay down the unfunded liability that resulted from all of those years prior to 1988 being on a pay-as-you-go basis.

So you'll see that employee contributions were repeatedly increased. I'll have a slide on that that I'll show you.

And the big thing and sometimes one of the distinctions with other systems in the nation that you hear about is employers are required to pay what's called their assessment or their annually required contribution actually changing the ARC name now as well. You're required to pay that, every entity, every unit; every town is required to pay that every year.

And that's important because that makes sure that at some point in the future the system's going to be fully funded. And those payments go towards the unfunded liability that accrued over time in the past.

This is the local board. You see me as the Chairman. Pat Flynn is the Commissioner's Appointee. Currently, their Advisory Board member is vacant. We expect that will be filled at an Advisory Board meeting on September 19.

The Advisory Board is the board statutorily established under Chapter 32 made up of all the treasurers of the units that are members of the retirement association.

Randy Sherman is an elected member. He's the former fire chief for the Town of Yarmouth. And Mark Foley is also an elected member. He's the deputy chief from the Town of Eastham.

And Debra Cohen is our executive director. Anytime you have a question about your own retirement, she's the person to call. She knows an awful lot about all of these things that elude me to some extent but she has the answers. And Jim Quirk is our board counsel, and he also happens to be a Selectman in the Town of Yarmouth.

I should say, if you have any questions, I would prefer that you just blurt them out, and I'll try to answer them as I go along. I think it's a lot easier than trying to pick up the pieces as we go through and get to the end.

One of the things I talk about because I think this is important for people to sort of be aware when they especially disagree with the Retirement Board and some of the decisions we make sometimes is we are required by the Code of Mass. Regulations, our fiduciary duty requires us to discharge our duties solely in the interest of members and their beneficiaries. And you see that's for the exclusive purpose of providing benefits to their members defraying reasonable expenses etcetera, etcetera. I'll go through a couple of these.

You see those care, skill, prudence and diligence under the circumstances, the prudent person rule, so-to-speak, in terms of investing or conduct of an enterprise, diversifying investments, those types of things, and in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Rules and Regulation.

For the private sector, that's governed by the ERISA Act. That's a federal act governing

private. Those are really the standards that apply to us as well. They're not the ERISA standards per se, but they're essentially mirrored in the Mass. Code of Regulations.

In terms of our system, this is our total membership. We had 4,670 active members basically. Those are employees, current members. Some of you may be members of the system here; some of you may not.

Ms. ANDREWS: Mark.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: We have 2,547 retirees -- Yeah, sure.

Ms. ANDREWS: Just so I'm following along with you. When you said "our system," you mean Barnstable County and all --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Barnstable County Regional System, yep.

Ms. ANDREWS: Okay. Thank you.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: We have 2,547 people receiving a benefit, retirees or beneficiaries. And we have 637 inactive members. Those are people who have money in the system and may be eligible to draw a benefit in the future but are not currently having deductions withheld. They probably aren't employed or whatever.

These are the current statistics, and, these, I think you have the handouts. Janice did the handout. I had printed it out and sent it to her last week I think. I made some changes, just some small changes in some of the data because I just got the data from our actuary. So, if you're following along, you'll see some of the numbers are a little bit different.

So 740 people between the ages of 70 and 79, 445 between 80 and 89, and actually this number went down. It had been going up steadily over the past few actuarial calculations we did, 100 are 90 and older. That was down from -- I think the last one said 105 or 106 in your handout.

But typically that 90 and over number is going up. So people are living longer. They're drawing a benefit longer. Those types of things, costing the system more essentially.

This is the contribution rates for people on their regular compensation and how much they're contributing. You see that if you became a member prior to January 1 in '75, you were a 5-percenter, they're called. There's not as many of those left as much anymore. They're retiring off fast.

Most of us all now are 9-percenters or what's called 9+2 because we have 2 percent of compensation in excess of \$30,000 deducted as well. Most of us now are 9+2's.

This is our average annual benefit level; it's 21,315. So you see that's a fairly modest pension. It's not a lot of money. You read about the pensions, the \$200,000 pensions, and the big benefits that you read about in the paper, but for most people, that's not the case at all.

You see 71 percent of our retirees receiving less than 26,388 total benefits; 51 percent are receiving less than 16,788. So, we're talking about modest pensions for people to live on in their retirement years.

There have been a lot of studies done on sort of how much a Group 1 person contributes to their retirement. The last study shown is about 75 to 80 percent. That is the employee themselves are funding 75 to 80 percent of their --

Ms. TAYLOR: What is Group 1?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I'm sorry?

Ms. TAYLOR: What's a Group 1?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Group 1 is all of the clerical, regular employees. And the way it's worded in Chapter 32, the retirement laws, you have Group 2, which is sort of hazardous duty people; you have Group 4, which is public safety people; Group 3 is state police, and everybody else is

Group 1.

And, basically, what it means is you're not really eligible for your maximum pension until you reach 65 in Group 1.

And just to give you some sort of idea, maybe you can compare this to sort of with the Social Security, and, remember, we're not a Social Security state, so we don't pay Social Security, and we're not -- if you just solely had your public sector work and are eligible for a regular Social Security benefit, you can see from our normal cost, and that's the cost every year that we have to pay into the system just for the person occupying that chair. Not the unfunded liability piece, but the person who's in a particular position for their future potential retirement benefit; the employee pays -- it's percent of payroll, 9.42 percent, and the employer is paying 5.65 percent. So that's less than --

Ms. ANDREWS: Mark.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Ms. ANDREWS: I hate to interrupt you but --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: No.

Ms. ANDREWS: You just said something that I have never heard. You said --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Who's asking?

Ms. ANDREWS: Me, Cheryl.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I'm sorry.

Ms. ANDREWS: You said we are not a Social Security state, and since I've never lived and worked anywhere else in my life, I had no idea that other states were different.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Ms. ANDREWS: Can you just clue me in what that means, how many states are versus our --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: If you --

Ms. ANDREWS: Who decides? The states or the feds?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: It's a little more complicated than that. Social Security was originally, if you talk to some people, it was a voluntary program. So some states joined and some did not.

In Massachusetts and for public sector employees now I'm talking about, they did not. So if you solely worked in the public sector in Massachusetts your entire career, you don't have your 40 quarters. So you wouldn't be eligible for a Social Security retirement benefit.

Ms. ANDREWS: No. I understand all that. I understand how it applies to Mass. What I didn't recognize -- I've never realized that other states did.

So my question is is Massachusetts unusual or are we typical? Is it 50-50 in this country?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: It's not 50-50. It is a minority of states that are not Social Security states, but the good news for us sort of in Congress when we talk about getting rid of the WEP, those Windfall Elimination Provisions, there's some big states that are either not or partially Social Security states, Texas, California, some of those big states have either no membership in Social Security or only partial membership. So it's a whole presentation in and of itself.

Ms. ANDREWS: I get that.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Now, one thing I just want to clarify because people get confused about it. A few years back, and I think it was mid-80's, Pat would know the answer to this question; everybody started those Medicare deductions. So you'll see that FICA thing on your paycheck, your deduction, a very small amount. That was intended to make people eligible for Medicare.

So, almost everybody in the public sector now in any state is going to be eligible for Medicare.

And that's important in the public sector now because Massachusetts has a law that passed in one of these reforms in the Municipal Relief Act that basically once you hit the eligibility for Medicare, your public employer is going to push you on it. You're going to be on Medicare. So that's going to be the primary insurer.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Mark, can I ask a question here?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yeah, sure.

Speaker BERGSTROM: You're talking to an audience of people here who make -- what do we make \$1,000.00 a year, so our deductions are minimal. But things like that Medicare deduction, is that an all or nothing thing? You're either in or your out or does it depend on how much money you throw in?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I think it's dependent on your salary. It's all a percentage of salary.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So, if I get hit by a truck, they'll only pay a certain -- Medicare will only pay a very small percentage?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Oh no. Your benefit -- if you qualify and you are eligible for Medicare, you are eligible for Medicare. It doesn't matter.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It doesn't matter how much you put in.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: No. No.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And the eligibility for Medicare is the same --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I think it's the same; it's 40 quarters.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Which is 10 years?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yeah.

Speaker BERGSTROM: In the Barnstable County system.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Its 10 years of employment in having those deductions taken.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And when were those deductions first taken?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: '85, '82.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So it's been over 10 years.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Somewhere in the mid-80's. Yeah, that's why I say almost everybody who's employed today at some point in time is going to be eligible. There's a few that are not. Like, we have a few of our more senior people on staff that will not be eligible for Medicare so.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Why is that? Because they --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Because they started before '85. So they don't -- if they started in '75 you didn't need to do the -- they weren't -- they didn't have the deductions taken in '85.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Oh, so if they didn't have deductions taken in the beginning when this law kicked in, they would not --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: They're grandfathered basically; grandfathered out, so-to-speak.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: That's only municipal employees.

Speaker BERGSTROM: That's only people in the system. We're talking about the people in the Barnstable County Retirement System?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: No. It's any employee. It doesn't matter. Any public sector employee whether they're in the system or not. It doesn't matter. That doesn't matter.

So this was some analysis PERAC did. This was the presentation given by Joe Connarton, and he's the executive director of PERAC.

A couple years ago he gave this at the Massachusetts Collector/Treasurers' Association meeting. And what they did was they looked at sort of two employees; one that was hired at 25 and

one that was hired at 35, and if they retired at various points in time at sort of an eligible retirement age. How much would they have contributed to their, you know, actuarially foreseen pension benefit. And you can see a person's whose 25 and retires at 55, they're paying 115 -- they've paid a hundred -- or basically subsidizing the system. They pay 115 percent of their pension benefit.

The one to me that's a little more unusual is maybe the 35 percenter. That means a 35 year old who retires at 65, they're paying almost 90 percent of their pension system -- pension benefit. So they're actuarial foreseen pension benefit -- the table says you're going to live 78, whatever it is for a man or whatever; they would pay 90 percent of the benefit that they would receive over that period of time their study indicated. So that's probably a pretty good deal.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, Mark, did he do this study to kind of counter the idea that the public employees are just milking the public for more than it is fair?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yeah. I think it's to give the impression that it's not -- you know, the public pension system, the way it's set up, is a pretty good deal. And this was actually before some of the reforms that I'm going to talk about in the future, which have had tendency to reduce peoples' pensions and lower system costs. How much? We don't know. There's been some numbers thrown out there statewide that the most recent pension reforms reduce the State's pension obligation by I heard 5 billion and who knows what that -- no one was able to sort of say how they came up with that number. But, theoretically, these reforms are going to save money. So, this was before that's factored in.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I'm a little confused on this. Now you're saying that someone who retires at let's say age 65 and he started at 35, so he paid -- the money he paid in would cover 89 percent of the benefits he's getting?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yeah. Let's say over the course of his 65 to whenever he dies, based on the actuarial table, he gets a total benefit; let's just say for easy, 100 bucks. Of that \$100 over the course of his employment career, he paid 89.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. But simultaneously, the County or his employer, the Town of Chatham or something, is also kicking in at least 50 percent of what he's kicking in. What happens to that money?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: They're kicking in an assessment, and you know what it really shows, and that's a good question, Ron. What it really shows is you know what you're paying for for much of the assessment; you're paying for all that unfunded liability that accrued over time prior to 1988. So that's sort of why we're in this -- if you want to say, in the boat we're in, why we're paying that unfunded liability knot is because for -- I think the pension system started -- it's one of the oldest ones in the country -- '22 or somewhere way back there. From '22 to '88; let's just say '22, and somebody can correct me in the future. It was pay-as-you-go.

So, whatever the bill was to all the pensioners, which are divided up by 51, that are how much the bill was. But it didn't take into consideration all the people who are working in 10, 15, 20 years who are going to draw a pension.

So you're paying -- that's what you're really paying. You have to pay that down that unfunded liability so. That's really what it says.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So it would be --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: So of your assessments, relatively a small portion is going to the pensioner who has been in the system for the whole time.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And that includes, I mean, obviously the money that someone gives in now at let's say hired at age 25 and 35 that goes into the pension system. You guys are investing that. If you get a reasonable rate of return --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: -- by the time that person retires, that money is going to double or triple. I mean it seems like a lot of money is going in and not much money is coming out.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: We'll talk about that. It's 8 percent. We actually just lowered it. So, we're actually figuring that we're going to get a little bit less than 8 percent but.

Ms. ANDREWS: Mark, for those of us who are impaired with math; the reality, if I'm watching this slide correctly, is that when you talk about an age at hire of 25, you're not talking about somebody who was 25 thirty years ago. You're talking about a 25 year old that's getting hired today?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: That's right. It would be a 9+2.

Ms. ANDREWS: So, we're not talking about --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: If you're hired today at 25 -- you know, the other kind of anomaly here is, you know, there are not many people who spent 40 years in one place. It doesn't happen. But it's just an illustration of how if they did, and you would think that those are the people who are really paying, you know, who are going to earn the most pensions. So they're going to have the highest benefit as well. So it shows you that side of it as well.

Ms. TAYLOR: So in 2040, this assessment problem will be maybe solved and then all costs will then go down?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes. Can I defer that question and I'll get to it when I get to the investment piece in just a little bit.

Ms. TAYLOR: All right.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Its a couple slides ahead. So let's just talk about investment performance. Julia raises an interesting question, and, for us, it's actually -- you'll see it. For the Barnstable County Retirement System, the magic year is 2038, and that will be the year that we should be fully funded.

And every year your treasurers in each of your towns get a -- they just got it this year, the actuarial report, and it shows you exactly how much as to be paid every year. And that assumes that you make your actuarially required rate of return and that's where this slide comes in.

This is our investment performance for the quarter and for the year as of 6/30/12. You see it was not a good quarter, so this is April, May, and June.

The PRIT fund, we are mostly -- all of our money is in the PRIT fund. And you know that's the states -- the one you read about in the paper.

Pension Reserve Investment Trust Fund. It's run by the PRIM Board. The Pension Reserve Investment Management Board, but the chairman is the treasurer of the state, most of our money's in there. Almost \$600 million is in the PRIT Fund.

When we moved our money in the PRIT Fund about four years ago, three years ago, four years ago, we had previously joined -- these are two real estate accounts. They're closed-end real estate accounts. Once you put the money in, you can't get it out until their done. So we're still in these two -- Allegis Value Trust and Intercontinental. And Intercontinental is actually a fund specializing in New England, in New England Real Estate. You can't get out. So, we continue to hold those two investments. You see the cash. But you see for the year and for the quarter, it wasn't such a great period. The fund was down a little bit.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Have you thought of getting out of the PRIT Fund?

Ms. KING: It's not an option.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: If we were to get out of the PRIT Fund; we did talk about this a little bit, that means we would have to try to do something like this. This is the PRIT Fund's core fund asset. This is the asset allocation. This is where the rubber hits the road. You have to pick a good

asset allocation in order to make money.

The PRIT Fund has made -- since inception, since their creation -- I don't know how many years ago, more than 10 certainly, they've earned over 9 percent annually per year. So that's pretty good.

So, yeah, we talked about it, and we talked about going back and doing it ourselves. Previous to four years ago, that's what we did but we were always behind the PRIT Fund, and we sort of got sick and tired of spending all this time beating our head against the wall and trying to beat the PRIT Fund and not being able to do it.

So, I will tell you, we're not big enough even at 600 million to do sort of private equity on our own. We just can't. Hedge Funds, no way; we're just not big enough. Timber and Natural Resources, that type of thing, we're just not big enough.

So, I would say that that's not likely. We'll probably, you know, stick in the PRIT Fund. We think they're doing a good job. They're having some issues right now with filling position. They're having some salary issues over there, but we think they can put those behind them.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Can you tell me what the 19 percent and the 17 percent is because I'm color blind.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yeah, sure. It's a little fuzzy too.

Ms. KING: Domestic Equity.

Mr. CAKOUNES: It looks like Private Equity but.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Domestic Equity 19 percent, and International Equity, 17 percent. Emerging Markets Equity, 7 percent.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Oh, I see that.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: There's supposed to be another. That's not right. That's Core Fixed Income but somehow the number got mixed up because that's not right. It looks like it's about 15 percent I would say. And that's one of the things I sort of wanted to point out. So, here's your equity pie; 20, 30, 49 percent I think it is, probably close to that. So your equities now are 49 percent.

Remember what it used to be? If you were to talk about 70/30, 60/40, 60 percent equity stocks trade on the market. Forty percent Fixed Income, bonds. We moved away from that. And even at the PRIT Fund, which is now becoming actually a little bit more conservative, you're talking about a 15 percent in your bonds. That's pretty low.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Did anybody look to find out why they went down so much in the last quarter because I mean, generally speaking, the stock market's been doing relatively well.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I don't have it in front of me, Leo, but, yeah, I could tell you exactly. I have the report, and it tells you -- it sort of has the attribution report. It tells you exactly what's down and what's up and why they were down. So, yeah, I could share that with you folks.

But this is sort of chasing that 8.25. Remember, this is their annually required rate of return is 8.25. This is chasing 8.25.

And then this you have Value-Added Fixed Income. Those used to be called junk bonds and those types of things, but "junk bonds" sounds pejorative. So, they called it Value-Added Fixed Income now.

Private Equities, Mergers and Acquisitions, those type of things; Real Estate, Timber and Natural Resources, and Hedge Funds. The PRIT Fund has been very successful more so since before we joined them than after, but they've been very successful in the Private Equities market. They have their own staff. They have -- it's a very relationship-driven business investing in private equity. They've been very successful at it. They're actually doing that with their Hedge Fund allocation now.

They had been what were called "Funded Funds" basically buying mutual funds and Hedge

Funds products. They're getting out of that. They're going to do it based on this direct investment into Hedge Funds, sort of relationship-driven stuff.

Ms. ANDREWS: Mark, I have a quick question.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yep.

Ms. ANDREWS: The slide before, can you just -- I just want to make sure I'm not making assumptions; those are percent numbers?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Percents, yes.

Ms. ANDREWS: Okay.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Percents for the period; yep. And if I had done this for the quarter before, all of those would have been up.

So, Asset Allocation. This is a little bit of what I was going to touch on with Julia's question. So, we could've extended our funding schedule to 2040; we extended it to 2038. That gives us a little play down the road if there's a bad investment year or something happens. So we didn't want to go to the full 2040, so we have a little room on that.

So, back to Julia's question. So in 2038, assuming we make this because we have an actuarially required rate of return in our investments of 7.875 percent; it was a couple of years ago was 8.25, now we reduced it to 8, and then just this year we reduced it to 7.875. I'm trying to bring that down.

So, from now until 2038 if we make this every year then the unfunded liability will be paid off; that will be zero, but you'll still have that normal cost thing. Everybody's who still in a position of working in the public sector in the Barnstable County Retirement System will still have a normal cost. So, they'll still be an assessment to the towns, but they'll be significantly smaller. It will be much smaller.

So that's a whole notion about this sort of funding schedule when you hear it. It's so that we can pay off the unfunded liability by 2038.

So this is the outcome of all that. When we did the funding schedule just this past year, the assessments to the member units will increase 6 percent over the next two years, so 2014 and 2015, and then between 4 and 5 percent annually thereafter, and that's, again, assuming your investment earns 7 and -- what is that; 7/8ths, I think; 7 and 7/8ths.

The other thing we did do when we did the actuarial changes, we were able to increase the COLA base so that a retiree gets a COLA on their retirement, but they only get it on the first 12,000 statutorily.

And so one of the things they passed, as part of these reform packages was the option, a local option, that you could increase your COLA base from 12,000 to some higher number by a thousand dollars per year. And what the board decided to do is increase it over the next three years to 15,000. And I think we're actually in year two of that at this point in time. So this year the COLA base is 14,000.

This is our most recent actuarial data, Funding and Actuarial Data. So the actuarial that your treasurers have in each of your towns is dated as of 1/1/12. Our funded ratio is 55.5 percent. It's actually up a little bit from last time. I think we were 53 percent last time.

You have 522.4 million in unfunded liability. That's what we're paying on through our funding scheduled. I said that we're fully funded in 2038. You see the normal cost contributions for the employee and the employer. That's based on percent of payroll. And we'll probably do another actuarial study in two years. You're required to do them every two years by PERAC. We have been doing them more frequently because of the volatility in the markets especially so we try and avoid spikes and assessments back to the member units, the towns. So we've been doing them more frequently.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Does that include --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Mark --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I'm getting an echo, I think.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No. The two of us have questions.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Does that include -- when you do the actuarial study, does that include looking at the age of our employees that we currently have?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Mr. CAKOUNES: That may possibly or will be coming possibly due for retirement?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I imagine if we have a younger staff, we would probably be able to drive that 7 percent number down.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: It does. It takes that into consideration. Actually, they do an examination of what the average age is and where it is. And I think, actually, our average age went up from this study till the --

Mr. CAKOUNES: I noticed that on the slide that you had the breakdown of the retirees. I was going to ask you that question back there. You don't have to go back. But it didn't tell us about the average age of our employees. I think this might be going higher.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I think it went up a little bit; I can check, but that's in the Actuarial Report. It's right in there. Yep, that's right in there as well.

Mr. CAKOUNES: So, Ron, you had --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yep, I did.

And I think you may have touched on this right at the beginning, so I missed it. What I'm trying to figure out is what's not covered in this. I'm looking at it from the position of a town Selectmen. Health costs/health care has nothing to do with this; right?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Nothing.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Just pension.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Correct.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And what about school employees, teachers; are they included in this?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Teachers, no. Teachers are members of Mass. State Teachers' Retirement. However, if you have a person working in a school: admin, staff, lunch ladies always comes up for us, they are -- Nauset, D-Y, they're in the system.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So teachers are not.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Teachers are not.

Speaker BERGSTROM: But other school-related employees may be?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Mark, can I?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yep.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It seems to me that obviously you explained earlier that we're not in -
- Massachusetts public employees are not in the Social Security System.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: In looking at this data, I'm wondering why not? I mean if I were paying Social Security instead of this, what would be the benefits?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Well, right now, that would tell you -- its two things really. Right now, I'll tell you as an employer, yeah, you're paying more. That's going up to 6 percent. It's a good point.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I don't care what my employer pays.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: But your Town does because they have to come up with the money. Plus, you're going to have all these people who are eligible for a pension who all of the sudden -- all the people who are succeeding me or are going to be down the road after I retire aren't contributing into the system anymore. So you're going to have a huge liability. It may not be this number but somebody's got to pay. You're going to have to pay.

So I think sort of the point goes back to if say -- somewhere in there is the right number, I guess, you mine as well have people who are like this contributing because, guess what, they're subsidizing the system.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yeah, but I don't want to subsidize the system.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Sure you do. This is not you, Ron. No. Oh, I understand. So you're talking from the employee perspective?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yeah.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: You're right. Good point.

Speaker BERGSTROM: What other perspective would I be looking at?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Although, I probably won't get the benefit from Social Security that I will from this.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Oh no? Well, --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Well, I'll get into the calculation.

So, I'm sorry. I thought you were speaking from the employer perspective, which is what I usually get. I very rarely get the employee perspective.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, with Social Security, you get a cost of living allowance -- you get a cost of living adjustment on your entire -- on every year on everything you get.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: But your benefit won't be as -- it won't be as great.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It won't be as great as this?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: No. Not for a person whose been in the system for 30 years.

So you say you're in the system for -- say you make maximum age, and I have an example of how it sort of calculates out before and after the reforms.

But say you're 65, you've been in the system for say 33 or 34 years; you're going to get 80 percent of your pension.

Ms. KING: Of your salary.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I mean you're going to get 80 percent of your salary is going to be your calculation.

Ms. KING: It's a little higher than Social Security.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yeah. And not everybody gets that. In fact, most people don't so they don't get 80 percent. And if you leave at 55, you'll see because of the age factor reduction, and actually one of the reforms was to accelerate the decrease in the age factor, you're going to get less and less. And you'll see that. Okay.

So, pension reform. We've been doing pension reform. It's a hot topic now but, frankly, you saw back in '87 and '88 they did pension reform. So we've been doing pension reform really now for the past three or four legislative years. They enacted -- many of them impacted you, and one of those was the \$5,000 rule. If you guys don't get credit for -- you don't get credible service for serving on the Assembly anymore. So that was one of the ones.

And then during the past '11-'12 legislative session, I'm going to go through some of the reforms that they passed. And some of these are pretty significant, and they're actually -- we're already seeing unintended impacts impacting people who are retiring now.

So, Chapter 176. And what I did for this presentation was break it down into whether it applies to current members, new members, or in this case current and new members. And this applies to both, current and new members.

And, basically, one of the things that they did was they increased the buyback interest rate if you had a prior service. I had prior service in the city of Westfield. I was on Public Works when I was in college. I don't know whether I got credit in the system for it or not.

So if I look and if I buy it back before April 13 of next year, then I pay the regular interest rate, which is half of what the new one will be, which is the actuarial interest rate. So it would be half of the 7 and 7/8ths.

If I wait and I want to buy it back, I'm going to have pay 7 and 7/8ths. It's like I had that money and I have to pay the interest on it.

Previously retired officials who were elected to office who wish to reenter service -- this happens once in a while, they may return their retirement allowance but they have to do with buyback interest. Currently, they don't have to pay any interest at all.

And one of the things it does -- and this makes a lot of sense is it prorates service according to years of service in each group. We went back to the group calculation. So, you calculate the retirement for each group, and then you apply a ratio based on the years of service whether in Group 1 or Group 4.

Currently, it's the last group worked. So I could work 34 years, 364 days in Group 1 and then go to work in Group 4 for one day -- probably have to be longer than that, but you get the flavor -- and retire, I would be a Group 4 employee and I get the Group 4 benefit.

But now they've prorated it so that I would get a calculation based on 34 years, 364 days, and a calculation based on 1 day.

As an opt-in for current, they didn't want to change it because it would punish people who went from Group 4 to Group 1, so you have a choice. So the people who go from Group 4 to Group 1 and retire now and current employees, they wouldn't pick that because it's punishing them. But after April 2 of this year, any employees after that it's mandatory. They have to have it prorated.

This is one of the things that apply to both current and new members. There are actually two anti-spiking provisions. The first one is for pension calculations. Any salary and wage increases are limited to no more than 10 percent of the average over the preceding two years.

And this is one that's impacting people now. We had this come up where it impacted a person who was retiring because 10 percent average over the preceding two years isn't hard to get to. It's actually if you get a 6.6 percent increase over two years, you're going to be at that; you're tripping that wire.

And there aren't any exceptions to it. And what I mean by exceptions is the bona fide personnel moves, promotions, bona fide salary increases, those types of things, it doesn't matter. And what that ends up doing is it trips a calculation from a three-year average to a five-year average, and that's happened to people already.

So, I don't know if that's one that will get fixed or not fixed, but it's impacting people already.

The other anti-spiking one is the annual rate of regular compensation received during the period of five consecutive years preceding your retirement, so you're five years going back. If it exceeds 100 percent in any two consecutive years, then they're going to do a different calculation. But that's very, very unusual. That's where they're looking really for the anti-spikings on this one.

But that one does have exceptions. So, if I get a promotion and your promotion doubles your salary, that's okay. Or if you work twice as many hours so you're getting 100 percent more pay, that's okay. It doesn't matter.

And then the other thing, just that a person retiring from an elected position has to wait one year before seeking election to that position again. Previously you could retire from a position, run for that position again, and get your salary and get your pension.

Now this is what I was talking about in terms of increasing the normal retirement age and accelerating the age factor reduction. So, right now, the normal retirement age is 65 for Group 1's and 55 for Group 4's. Group 4 is mostly public safety people.

The reform moved the normal retirement age up by two years from 65 to 67 for Group 1 and 55 to 57 for Group 4. But it also increases the rate that the age factor is reduced for each year less than normal retirement age. And the best way to show you what all of that means is to give you an example.

So say you have an employee that has 30 years of service. Currently at 65, they would receive 75 percent of their benefit. So I've got their maximum age factor times their years of service; 2.5 times 30. So each year less than 65, if they want to retire before 65, the factor decreases at .1. So, if we're at 60 years, they would receive 60 percent of their salary because it's 2.0 times 30. So it went down 5/10ths because it's five years of a decrease.

But now, under the new law, it's really a double whammy because the normal age is now 67 so it's higher, and the age factor decreases faster. So if that same person, under the new rules, wanted to retire at 60, the factor is decrease 7 times, not 5. And the factors decrease at a faster rate, .15 instead of .1.

So at 60 years old, this is the same person under the new rules, they'd only get 43.5 percent of their salary rather than the 60 percent of their salary because 30 times the 2.5 minus blah, blah, blah.

So that's how the age factor works, and that was one of the reforms that they passed. This is new members only, I should mention.

So these are for anybody who becomes a member of the system after April 2 of 2012 (sic). That's going to impact a lot of people, and their pension's going to be less.

We've asked our actuaries to sort of start thinking about so how do you figure how much money these are going to save, and it's a hard question. It's a very hard question to kind of think about and sort of figure out.

So new member-only reforms sort of changes the termination allowance provision. That's been in the news a lot. It allows people -- I'm sorry -- employees with 10 or more years of service who failed nomination, reelection or removed to retire at the minimum retirement age, which is going to be for Group 1 is 60 years old and for Group 4 is 50. There is no minimum retirement age right now.

It eliminates the provision for retirement below the minimum age with 20 or more years of service and allows superannuation only at the minimal retirement age. If I have 20 years of service, which I do, I could retire right now even though I'm not at that minimum age, but that's going to be eliminated. So you'll have to be 60 in order to receive the superannuation retirement for all new members after -- who join after April 2.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Don't you think this might spur some -- Those two changes that you're talking about, the second one there, the 20 years or more service and then the previous slide where you said that the average retirement age has been increased by two years; don't you think some of our employees might be calculating whether they should retire now?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Well, these won't apply. If they're current employees, this doesn't apply to them. So they'll be fine. They still have --

Mr. CAKOUNES: So it's only an employee that started from --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: After April 2.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Okay. Yep.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: So a current employee will still be able to retire with their maximum age factor of 65. They don't have to wait until 67.

Some of the other provisions, they impose a lot of governance provisions on retirement board members. So now I have to earn CEU credits. So I have extras, which I'm auctioning off. I don't see any prohibition in the law about auctioning extras off, so I'm going to do that.

It changed some of the rules for same-sex partners, so treat them similarly to opposite-sex partners.

Expanded the process for recovering pension payments from convicted retirees. Currently, it's basically at the point of conviction. Now it goes back to the point of the offense. So it goes back in time.

Requires a cost analysis. Bills providing specific benefits to certain individuals. I think that's been around for awhile.

And another thing, your Town's going to -- you're going to love this; we do. We have to review all of your collective bargaining documentation for impacts to the pension system. I don't know what that means, but we're supposed to collect now all your collective bargaining agreements and go through them and see if there are things that either don't meet what the pension requirements are or whatever. I'm not sure, but that's going to be a lot of work.

And finally, you've probably maybe read some stuff in the paper. They're going to study structural reforms to the current pension system. And they're talking about hybrids, and they're talking about combining DB, you know, we have a Defined Benefit Plan. DC Defining Contribution Plan, which is like a 457 system.

The other thing that's coming down the pike is they're going to be looking at health insurance contributions. You can bet your bottom dollar that -- right now, if you have 10 years and you're invested in the system and you retire, you can get a health insurance benefit, and it's typically at whatever rate the locality offers their retirees at the County, 75-25 employee -- employer pays 75; employee pays or retiree pays 25. Some towns are 50-50.

They're going to look at that and they're going to say if you've only got 10 years, why are you getting a 75 percent contribution rate? You should get something less. They're going to be looking at those types of things next.

So that's me and that's Debbie if you need to contact us. And I thank you for your time.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Is there any other questions for Mark on this long and -- Mark, I have a question for you, and I probably know the answer already, but I have to bring it up.

There was one slide there that said you're obligated by law to act in the interest of the employee, retired employees and the people who -- the members, so-to-speak; all right?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So does that mean that -- I mean, if I put money in the Barnstable County Retirement Associations, it gets invested in some corporation and I don't like what they're doing; they're investing in white slavery or they're running sweatshops.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Into Bernie Madoff or something like that?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Or Bernie Madoff. Well, Bernie would cheat me. These corporations are making money for me, but they're doing it in ways that, you know they're giving contributions to candidates running on the bipartisan ticket or something; is there any consideration to those kinds of things by the people?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: We talked about doing -- what is that called, Pat? He's talking about like green investing. That's not the word; there's a word for it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Socially responsible.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Socially responsible.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yeah, we have, as a board, chosen not to do that approach at this point.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So we're being socially irresponsible.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: We're socially irresponsible.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well --

Ms. TAYLOR: Mark.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yeah, we've talked about it. We've looked at it, and we just have not chosen to go down that path I guess is what I'm saying.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So when I get little cards in the mail to vote for one of these guys, I can ask him that question, the people who are elected members?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: You could ask; yes. Yes, you could ask them, yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: The board member, you, Pat, etcetera, are acting solely in the interest of members and their beneficiaries?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: Now "members" includes the Town of Yarmouth and the town --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: No.

Ms. TAYLOR: Or does it only mean employees?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: No. It's the person is a member.

Ms. TAYLOR: So you're not acting in the interest of Barnstable County or the Town of Yarmouth on this board?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: And that's a fiduciary duty. That's a big standard.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yeah, that's kind of --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yes, that's a big standard.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yep.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: But there is, I don't think, and I don't want to say this in front of Pat because she'll not want to do it anymore, and she's very good; if people sort of knew what that burden was, they wouldn't want to do it.

Ms. TAYLOR: I have a fiduciary responsibility that I hate.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: We're lucky. We have not been sued because of any investment losses. We haven't been involved in the Madoff thing. We haven't been involved in those scandals. But, yeah, it's a big nut.

Speaker BERGSTROM: But you don't really control much of the investments. It's sent up to this treasurer in the State Retirement Board.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: You know, that's good point, Ron, because when we -- it's sort of the first question we said when we went into the PRIT Fund is does that mean I'm not a fiduciary anymore? I don't tell them what to do with their money. They pick that asset allocation. I can have input. I can comment on it but they're going to do what they want. But that doesn't dissolve me of my fiduciary responsibility. Not one iota. The statute that established the PRIT Funds specifically made them exempted them from a fiduciary duty.

Now the good news is is by picking the PRIT Fund, that's a fiduciarly acceptable decision, but I'm still responsible for that \$600 million.

Speaker BERGSTROM: The other question and I know I don't want to beat this to death, but I mean they are obligated by law to get a return of over 7 percent, close to 8 percent too.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Theirs is actually 8.25 percent.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Eight and a quarter. I mean, how can you -- right now if some retired person with \$500,000 in the bank, they couldn't do any better than 2 percent.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: If they were able to do an asset allocation like this --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yeah.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: -- their analysis shows short-term that their return is going to be less than 8 percent. That's why we moved -- short-term being a 3 to 5 year window -- that's why we moved -- we've been moving our actuarially assumption down because we're not comfortable at 8.25 where we were a couple years ago.

Their long-term analysis of that investment allocation mix though shows substantially higher than 8.25. I don't know the number off the top of my head but probably close to 9. But that's the 30-year window. And don't forget, this is a long-term investment. We're not talking short-term; we're talking long-term. It's sort of an important point; this is the long-term window, not a short-term window.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Well, thank you, very much, and someday we may be all beneficiaries of this.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: We certainly hope so.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Is there any Communications from Public Officials?

Do I have any Communications from Members of the Public?

Hearing none. The Assembly will now convene.

Assembly Convenes

Proposed Resolution 12-03: To approve certain budget transfers for fiscal year 2013 in accordance with Barnstable County Ordinance 12-04.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We'll begin with Proposed Resolution 12-03, transfer between budget groups for the Water Protection Collaborative, and I will ask the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. Ohman, for a report on this.

Oh, it's a Resolution. He doesn't have one.

Mr. OHMAN: I don't have it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sorry. You don't have it. I've got it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Well, I stand corrected. It's a Resolution, and we have -- you should have received copies of this electronically. It's a decrease of \$5,100 and an increase of \$5,100. So it's a transfer between two line items.

Ms. ANDREWS: Not line items. I think it came --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, whatever it is. So I need a motion on this to approve or not approve of Resolution 12-03. Do you guys know what we're talking about? Yes, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I suggest only because we have Mark here that maybe we suspend the rules and be able to ask some questions about this because I'm not prepared to do anything on it without some information.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Then you have to make a motion to do that.

Mr. CAKOUNES: So moved.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Do I hear a second?

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: To move to suspend the rules, all those in favor, say "aye."

Opposed? (Motion carries). Mark. Help me out here.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I think this is the Water Protection Collaborative one; the \$5,000 one?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Yes, 5,100.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I think they hired -- I should say that in the future tense, but an intern for the Water Protection Collaborative. He had the money but it wasn't in a --

Mr. CAKOUNES: Salary and Wage account?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: -- Salary and Wage Account, so we're moving it from whatever account to the Salary and Wage account. I think that's what that one was \$5,000; is that what it says?

It says like a 239 to a 101 or a 110 or a 100?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. So it's \$5,100.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Yep.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Don't go anywhere because we have another one coming up. Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Just on the discussion part of this, Mr. Speaker. This was brought forth as a Resolution as proposed as instead of an Ordinance so it did not go in front of the Finance Committee for their review.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: May I, Mr. Speaker?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Any time we do a transfer out of one or if we change the numbers 1, 7, 9, 8, and maybe there's another one out there, we have to come to the Assembly; we being the Commissioners have to come to the Assembly with a Resolution to get -- seek permission for the transfer. That's in the budget ordinance.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, but some --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Let me just expand on that; 2, which is Professional and Contractual Services; 3, Supplies; 4, Other Stuff, and 5 Equipment. We can do it amongst those groups ourselves. A Department can do it themselves between any one group. They have to come to the Commissions between those 2, 3, 4, and 5 groups.

Speaker BERGSTROM: But there's also times when you have to submit an ordinance to do these transfers between; is that true?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: I think you're confusing that with when we do a transfer out of the two reserve funds that we have in the budget.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: But we're not doing that. This is simply under the budget ordinance, a transfer from already appropriated money, from a Salary and Wage account or the other two accounts, mostly its Salary and Wages and Fringe Benefits.

We actually -- it's a preferable way to do it is you have to take this sort of extra step to take money out of a Salary Wage Account or put money into a Salary Wage Account.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yeah, within the department.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: It has to be within -- we can't do intra-departmental transfers. You can't do that period.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I know it may not be protocol, but I think in the future because we've had a couple of these situations come before us and we were not lucky enough to have Mark here in the room, and no one was able to answer questions.

I would suggest that maybe in the future when transfers like this come forward that they can at

least be submitted to the Finance Committee so that maybe even questions can be asked ahead of time.

I mean I want to know, you know, what account did we have a increase of \$5,100 budgeted in that we foresee now in not even the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year that we don't need it and we, in fact, I want to transfer to Salary and Wages to hire an intern.

And I'm not sure if Mark's capable of answering that question on the spot or if it should have been asked prior?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Personally, and I don't say this, my philosophy would be the department manager feels that that's the best use of the money that we've given him.

When he put his budget together back in December, which is when he put it back, maybe he didn't foresee this change in circumstances. I don't have an issue with it. I really don't. It's sort of a -- he's operating within his budget.

If he came back and said, "I need 5,000 in supplemental to do that," then I have maybe different feelings. But if he's operating within his budget and he says, "Well, I'd rather use that 5,000 instead of buying a widget that I'd like to hire an intern for whatever period of time." I would say, "Its okay with me."

Speaker BERGSTROM: Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: And the follow-up question I would have asked is did the members of the Wastewater Collaborative vote in any way to support this expenditure?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: That's a question you have to ask Andrew.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. We have an Ordinance --

Ms. TAYLOR: I'll move the Resolution.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. KING: I'll second it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. We move to approve Proposed Resolution 12-03. Is there any other further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor --

Ms. ANDREWS: Roll call?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. We'll take a roll call on this.

Roll Call Vote on Proposed Resolution 12-03: To approve certain budget transfers for fiscal year 2013 in accordance with Barnstable County Ordinance 12-04.

Voting YES (88.51%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Spyro Mitrokostas (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), , Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Voting NO (5.67%): Leo Cakounes (5.67% - Harwich),

Absent (5.82%): Paul Pilcher (1.27% - Wellfleet), Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster

Ms. O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, Proposed Resolution 12-03 passes with 88.51 percent voting "yes"; 5.67 percent voting "no", 5.82 percent absent.

Proposed Resolution 12-03: To approve certain budget transfers for fiscal year 2013 in accordance with Barnstable County Ordinance 12-04.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Now we have come to Proposed Resolution 12-04.

Proposed Resolution 12-04: To approve certain budget transfers for fiscal year 2013 in accordance with Barnstable County Ordinance 12-04.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. We now move on to Proposed Resolution 12-04 to approve certain budget transfers for fiscal year 2013 in accordance with Barnstable County Ordinance 12-04. This is for the Water Protection Collaborative -- Oh, wait a minute. Excuse me. This is IT. This is for IT; 50,500. Do we have any comment on this? Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I see that in the audience our IT Director is here. I would make a motion that we suspend the Rules of Order and ask him to comment on this, once again, because we have no information about it.

Ms. KING: I'll second that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. All those in favor of suspending the Rules, say "Aye." Opposed? (Motion carries.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: Step up to the plate. And while we're waiting, I tend to agree with Leo. I think that, despite what the policy's been in the past, if we're asked to approve these things, to require that we approve them, we should have a recommendation from the Finance Committee.

Did you have some questions, Leo?

Mr. CAKOUNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. Could you please explain to me the need for this transfer, and I see there's two line items you're taking it out of, I presume, some line item that you were planning on purchasing something and increasing a salary line item or do I have that backwards?

Mr. MORSE: I believe you have that correct. I believe it's coming out of Professional Services and being requested to be transferred into Salary in order to -- basically, what's going to happen -- I think six months ago when we discussed the IT budget for FY'13, there were questions, frankly, from a couple of you about whether it was time to kind of look at whether the staff mix was right or was that amount of professional services really going to be -- could be appropriately used by the Barnstable County IT Department.

And what's going on is I've continued to reflect on the amount of work and analyze the amount of work we're performing and looked and see that pretty much we really need some admin support.

So, in order to try to use Professional Services Funds to do those sorts of things, we tried a couple things, and it's just not cost-effective.

So, at this point in time, what we're trying to do is to reallocate within the Department our tasks, bring in somebody from an admin perspective to help -- to be able to do the things that every other County department has admin support to do and really provide better services to all 15 departments or however many County departments we're serving.

So that's, in essence, what's going on here is that amount of transfer would cover a person to do that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yeah, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: So basically we're taking a Professional Services line item where we would be hiring a contractor to do services for us, and you're transferring \$50,500 out to hire a new person.

Mr. MORSE: Right.

Mr. CAKOUNES: This will be a new, full-time employee?

Mr. MORSE: Right.

Mr. CAKOUNES: And where does their benefits factor in onto this \$50,000?

Mr. MORSE: They're factored into that number. That number covers that because you only

see the group number here, but that is in the amount basically.

Mr. CAKOUNES: So by approving this, we basically are hiring another person, so next year's budgetary line item under Salary and Wages will be increased by \$50,000.

Do you anticipate that your line item for the purchase of contract services will remain as it is now with this 50 out or will you be looking to level fund that back to 50 again?

Mr. MORSE: I would anticipate that based on -- I would expect that there would be some adjustments for losing this money, for transferring this money.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Let me ask you a question. I presume that the contract services would be professional help to the IT Department. In other words, you'd go out source some of this stuff, but now you're talking about the 50,000 being for an admin person, which, to me, sounds like they're not really going to be professional services. They might be answering the phone and doing the formatting and printing. Are you hiring someone to do that?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: It's a mix of jobs, which is really what was a mix of tasks, which was getting us into a problem here. If we need somebody, part of this job is designed to help us do quality assurance on our trouble tickets, our support arm. Well, that takes somebody with some sort of speciality.

Another piece of what we're trying to do here is get some assistance on managing the IT Department's contracts, its vendor relationships, and its procurement responsibilities. That takes an entirely different sort of person.

And the reality is that once we started trying to realize we needed help in these different sorts of areas, to hire Professional Services Specialists in all those areas, it jacks up to a lot more than that pretty quickly because of the diverse nature of what we're looking to get done.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So you basically -- all individually basically are sharing this responsibility. In other words, the employees of your department are sharing these responsibilities as opposed to doing, you know, more involved work with IT; you're also doing all this other stuff to basically make the office run and make it work.

Mr. MORSE: Exactly.

Speaker BERGSTROM: John.

Mr. OHMAN: Why couldn't you foresee this in time to put it right in the budget in its proper place so we could assess it properly with its proper allocation for travel for benefits for retirement? It's a backwards way to do, but what was the problem with figuring it out?

Commissioner FLYNN: Maybe I should take that. I think --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: John, that's probably us. We had more philosophy where we were -- I think we recognized that IT needed more bodies, but we weren't in a position where we were ready to fund permanent positions at that point in time. I think that's changed, and I think we're trying to recognize it. If it's shame on us, shame on us.

But I think, you know, that's where we were back then. And back then it was maybe a little bit different than where they are now. So.

Mr. OHMAN: That's just because there's a difference between a \$5,000 curveball and a \$50,000 curveball and it bothers me.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Well, they're set in like two different bodies. You can't compare a summer intern to a sort of permanent position.

Mr. OHMAN: Right.

Mr. MORSE: And the only thinking requesting that you seriously consider this and/or approve it, the only thing I would add to what Mark said is the County Commissioners and the Assembly of Delegates, the ability that you work with us and you've been able to allow us to grow our IT budget

for the County this year -- in these last two years. That's a great thing but it kind of has exacerbated the situation. It's made it harder for us to be able to do the types of tasks that I've talked to you because the scale of them has increased at the same time.

We could identify the need before, but as the budget has gone up, the amount of time to do all of those tasks has gone up exponentially.

Speaker BERGSTROM: If you can use -- if this would mean that the higher-paid employees can operate more efficiently and spend a better amount of their time doing the things that they are good at then I can see it.

You know, I mean I don't -- there may be some difficulty as to how the Assembly deals with this. The issue is that if we take this request as evidence that maybe they didn't need the 50,000, you know, initially, they're never going to ask for another request like this.

So, they're not increasing their budget, so I don't see what the issue is. We'll have to beat it -- when we see the new budget, then we can go into it.

As far as a transfer like this during the existing fiscal year, I mean if we were to say, "Well, geez, you know, you guys could have come in at a lower number," like I say, we'll never hear from them again during the fiscal year.

Pat, did you have something to say?

Mr. PRINCI: Yes. Is any part of the justification for this -- there was mention at the last meeting with Tom; I think it might have been Truro --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Wellfleet.

Mr. PRINCI: -- looking for the -- what was it; Wellfleet?

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Wellfleet, yes.

Mr. PRINCI: -- Looking for the support for their town's IT Department due to the County services, and they were also going to be reciprocating that extra resource through funds they're transferring into the County. Is there any justification relative to that?

Mr. MORSE: Well, I do say that it impacted the work level. It definitely impacted the work level from an admin perspective here.

The reality is in addition to the one point whatever million dollar budget that the Assembly of Delegates has been able to grant us, we are actually in effect managing the \$140,000 town of Wellfleet IT budget too and trying to figure out what we are even committed to from a contractual point of view with third-party vendors and supporting those things.

So it kind of was like the --

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: The straw that broke the camel's back?

Mr. MORSE: Exactly. The final tipping point to kind of push this. So, yeah. "Yes" is basically the easiest answer for that question.

Mr. PRINCI: I'm relatively new to this Board, but did you have the contract through the Town of Wellfleet before the last budget cycle?

Mr. MORSE: No. The contract -- the negotiations started in March and the contract was not signed until June of this year.

Mr. PRINCI: Okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Spyro and then Marcia.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Oh, is that --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Spyro.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: As a technical question; \$50,000 will be prorated or \$50,000 will be expended?

Mr. MORSE: Prorated based on hire date.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Based on when you hire. And for the edification of the public, if not the Assembly, it's not necessarily directed to you but maybe to the Speaker; could you explain the road that this Resolution traveled to get to this point?

Speaker BERGSTROM: They handed it to us.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: When you say "they"?

Speaker BERGSTROM: The Commissioners.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: So the County Commissioners -- this request would have gone to the County Administrator to the County Commissioners, and then presented to the Assembly?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Right. You got a copy.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: And just to maybe reiterate. The Resolution for transfer process originates in those darkened dank sections of the budget ordinance in the back. I don't remember which one it is. Janice should know but she doesn't either because we don't read those.

But once in a while, I tear out those back damp and dank sections and I read them, and they say -- it tells -- and this started maybe a few years ago -- what you have to do. And it says if you want to transfer between a 1 and a 1, a Salary Account -- Salary Group and a Fringe Benefit, and mostly those two and I think there's one other kind of weird group in there that you have to go to the Assembly. And so that's where this all originates from.

So what a typical process is that the department -- this is not a frequent process by any means. I think we're sort of -- there's I think three of them in front of you now. The one that we submitted today that Commissioner Flynn submitted today is one we do every year. So, that one would come to you every year from the AmeriCorps program one. That's typically the only one we do.

There are maybe one or two others that appear infrequently that I can't even remember. So this is a little bit unusual.

But typically what will happen a department manager will say, you know, I need money for this, that, or the other thing in 1 account or in a 9 account.

And, typically, I will, because that's a pain in the butt for me, I will try to dissuade them from that. So, we'll have a conversation about is there another way to do that.

So that's why there aren't too many of these because we usually try to find a different way to do it.

So if we can't find another way and we say, "Okay. That makes sense," then I will put together the Resolution. I bring it to the Commissioners, the Chair, the Commissioner's signs it, and we transmit it to you guys.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. But -- yeah, Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: Yeah.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And I haven't forgotten Marcia. Don't worry about it.

Ms. KING: That's all right.

Ms. TAYLOR: Oh, I'm sorry.

Ms. KING: No. I was just going to say there seems to be a bunch -- a lot of questions. On my 12 years on the Board, I have not seen that many Resolutions, and the magnitude I think of the value at \$50,000 I think is really kind of giving some attitude to all of us.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Sure. Yeah.

Ms. KING: I would suggest, and I'm not sure I need to make a motion, is that it does come from the Finance Committee so that it can be better. And the other members that can sit and listen to it because I think this -- to me, the value is so large, the question becomes what a lot of other ancillary questions have come up. And so that's what I would like to see because I think there are too many variables.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, the issue is this, Mark, is that obviously in the process that you've described, what happens is that you submit it, right, and then it's given to the full Assembly after we convene.

So, basically, all we've got is this. In other words, it doesn't even have a cover letter.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: Oh, I'm not objecting, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No. I understand.

County Admin. ZIELINSKI: You know, and I hate when people say this to me, "That's how we've always done it."

(Laughter.)

That's sort of the answer, you know, why we're in this quandary.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, I stupidly assumed, probably not even looking at it, that it was going to go to the Finance Committee, but now I realize the process, and I'm sure that Janice knows this too --

Ms. O'CONNELL: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: The process in the past has been exactly as you've described it. I mean I personally don't have an objection to this. From what I'm gleaning is you have a bunch of people who are computer professionals who are doing their thing, and they don't want to have to take - - rather than have -- they don't want to take time out to call a supplier and tell them they need more paperclips and to do other things that are not directly related to their responsibility.

So rather than hire outside help with the 50,000, they can, in turn, compensate that by spending more of their time on those things and have the admin person who will basically run the office and do the other stuff. That's how I see this 50,000.

So it doesn't sound like a bad idea.

Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I agree with Marcia. I think they've done the right thing. It's just that it could be that we would like to change our procedures if people feel strongly about it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. TAYLOR: That amounts over "X" would go to the Finance Committee even though it's not an ordinance, even though it's just a Resolution.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, there's no law that says we can't do that. We can do that.

Ms. TAYLOR: Right and we can do that, of course. And we can have that be a standard procedure if we want to.

I would go ahead and personally I'd be willing to vote it, but if people don't want to do that, then we could put it off.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Teresa.

Ms. MARTIN: I just want to say why I'm uncomfortable with this because basically between this and the other one, the IT staff is adding two FTE's outside the normal budget process, and that makes me very uncomfortable.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Marcia.

Ms. KING: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a Motion to send this Resolution 12-04 to the Finance Committee for review.

Ms. TAYLOR: Second.

Ms. KING: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Any other further comment on the Motion from the table?

Hearing none. All those in favor -- Do we need --

Mr. OHMAN: Yeah, we need a vote.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Let's do a roll call. It doesn't hurt. I don't think we need one.

The Motion does not -- I'll take a roll call, but the vote -- the Motion does not contain any financial implications, but we'll take the roll call.

Roll Call Vote on Motion to refer Proposed Resolution 12-04 to the Finance Committee for review and a recommendation to the full Assembly.

Voting YES (94.18%): 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), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Spyro Mitrokostas (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), , Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Voting NO (0%)

Absent (5.82%): Paul Pilcher (1.27% - Wellfleet), Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster

Ms. O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, Motion to refer Proposed Resolution 12-04 to the Finance Committee for review and a recommendation to the full Assembly passes with 94.18 percent voting "yes"; 0 percent voting "no", 5.82 percent absent. (Motion carries).

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Okay. Mr. Speaker, before we leave this, a representative, Mr. Princi, asked a question in regards to the association between the IT Department and the Town of Wellfleet. I just want to bring for your knowledge that there is another proposal coming forward to add \$80,000 -- 88,000 to their budget, which equals the direct amount that they will be billing the Town of Wellfleet. I think that kind of better might answer your question that was asked previous.

So although this may be indirectly related to that situation. You should be aware that there is going to be a proposal coming forward for your consideration specifically for an amount of money dedicated to that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. And I don't see it on the agenda, which would normally be the report from the committees.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Because they would technically or formally give a report next week before you vote on the Proposed Ordinance.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Because they haven't had a chance to approve their minutes. Okay. Well, Leo's comment is timely then.

Okay. So the ball is in the court of the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. Ohman, and we will schedule a hearing on that.

Mr. OHMAN: I think sooner is better than later. If we can do it, if just the committee meets, why can't we do it at three o'clock before the next meeting?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. We'll schedule that if it's all right with your members if they can all make it. Janice will send out a notice.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We know move on to reports from the Clerk.

Report from the Clerk

Clerk O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the next meeting, just to fast-forward a little bit, you will be voting on one Proposed Resolution that was submitted today by the Commissioners. Unless you want that to go to Committee, that is for AmeriCorps. Why bring it forward if you want that to go to a Committee --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, we can't vote on it now, so we'll bring it forward, and if they want to go to a Committee, we can vote at the time.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Okay. You will also be voting on one Proposed Ordinance, the one that was at Committee today for IT. And there will be a committee meeting next week, not a public hearing because it's not an ordinance; ordinances get public hearings. This is not an ordinance, so it will be a committee meeting to bring forward a recommendation to you regarding Proposed Resolution 12-04.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Clerk O'CONNELL: And I think that's it. I'll quit while I'm ahead.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: I want to beg your indulgence and ask the Clerk for some information, and maybe you can get it if we don't have it, because I know under other business, we may be taking some time to discuss some resolutions.

About six months ago, we were given a projected General Fund balance, and it's now past the close of the year, and I'm wondering if we can ask for an actual General Fund balance in the lieu of having the County Administrative here to do it, we might, in fact, just get --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Did you not get the budget? Is that not included in there?

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: It's not included. The General Fund balance changes haven't been included in it. That's why I'm asking for it.

So, I will be satisfied if they just sent us that accounting before we came to actually have the County Administrator back to talk about the budget.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I can ask.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Is there any other business before -- wait a minute; where are we?

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Other Business?

Other Business

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Any Other Business to be brought before the Assembly? Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Mr. Speaker, I have sent to the Clerk electronically, and now I would like to hand in some Proposed Resolutions. There are five of them in all.

I have at the tailpiece page here; I have a small paragraph which states that it will be up to the Speaker and the Clerk to not only number the resolutions but bring them forward for discussion and pass them out to the members.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you. Well, we'll send these out. We actually have sent these out. It was sent to me, but did you send it to the Assembly members?

Clerk O'CONNELL: No. I only sent them to you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Well, now they're all going to get them. Now they've been officially submitted.

Is there any other business to be brought before the Assembly?

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: It's my turn. Motion to Adjourn.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Moved and seconded. All those in favor, say "Aye."

Opposed?

Whereupon, it was moved, seconded and voted to adjourn the Assembly of Delegates at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O'Connell, Clerk
Assembly of Delegates