

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT  
ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES**

APPROVED Journal of Proceedings – March 5, 2014

Speaker BERGSTROM: Good afternoon. Hello. Welcome to the March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2014 session of the Cape Cod Regional Government, Assembly of Delegates.

Is there anyone recording this session besides -- no, I guess not.

Okay. I will 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.)

Thank you.

We will now stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you. The Clerk will call the roll.

**Roll Call (99.07%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Leo Cakounes (5.67% - Harwich), Ned Hitchcock (1.27% - Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% -Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% -Mashpee), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Anthony Scalese (4.55% -Brewster), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).**

**Absent (0.93%): Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro).**

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, we have a quorum with 99.07 percent of the Delegates present; 0.93 percent absent.

**Committee of the Whole**

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you.

I'll need a motion to approve the Calendar of Business today?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: So moved.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All those in favor?

(Motion carried.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Now on the approval of the Journal of February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014. You should have received a copy of the Journal.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Move Approval of the Journal of February 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Moved and seconded. No additions or corrections?

Okay. All those in favor say "Aye."

Speaker BERGSTROM: Opposed?

(Motion carried.)

Ms. KING: I abstain.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: Abstained.

Mr. KANAGA: Abstained.

Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners: County Administrator

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. We have the usual number of Regional Commissioners here today so I guess we will skip that, unless the Administrator has anything to say.

ADMINISTRATOR BRILLHART: Mr. Speaker/Delegates, good afternoon. Michael Brillhart here on behalf of the Board of Regional Commissioners to present to you a Proposed Ordinance regarding a supplement appropriations for the current fiscal year 2014 budget.

(Handing Proposed Ordinance to Speaker.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you. Well, I guess we'll have a hearing before the --

Clerk O'CONNELL: March 12<sup>th</sup>.

Speaker BERGSTROM: -- March 12<sup>th</sup> before the Finance Committee, John.

Mr. OHMAN: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And we'll put this on the agenda at the next available opportunity.

ADMINISTRATOR BRILLHART: Yes, sir.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you.

ADMINISTRATOR BRILLHART: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: That's it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Do we have Communications from Public Officials; Members of the Public?

Assembly Convenes

Committee Reports

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. The Assembly will now convene. We have committee reports, Economic Affairs. Who am I looking at for Economic Affairs? Yes, Marcia.

Ms. KING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Economic Affairs had a meeting last week and we discussed the Arts Foundation and the Economic Development piece of the Cape Cod Commission.

We did not vote on it, but this is a vote just for the minutes. And I hope that Jim and Ned have read them because the three of us can vote.

So I will make a motion -- oh, can I have a motion? Jim, can I have a motion to approve the minutes?

Mr. KILLION: Move to approve the minutes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Second.

Ms. KING: Okay. All those in favor? Aye?

It passes 3 to 0. Thank you.

(Motion passed.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. And now we have Natural Resources. Is that Julia or Leo?

Ms. TAYLOR: Leo.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for the record, I am the vice chair by I chaired the meeting on February 26 because Ms. Taylor was out of town.

In the report, we at 3 o'clock started our meeting. We heard from the Cape Cod

Commission. We heard from the Cooperative Extension Service, Health and Environment, and the Cape Cod Water Protection Collaborative.

There were -- I believe there were no recommendations and votes taken. There were a number of, I don't want to say real pertinent questions, but questions that we felt were pertinent enough that at that time we decided not to take a vote. So we're waiting to hear back some answers to those questions.

They're all addressed in the draft minutes. They're presently the other draft minutes of February 26, 2014.

And if I may indulge, Mr. Speaker, seeing that the committee is present, I would like to have the committee or one of the members of the committee make a motion to approve the minutes if they are, in fact, willing to do that at this time.

Mr. SCALESE: So moved.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Second?

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Second.

Mr. CAKOUNES: All those in favor of approving the minutes as submitted? Aye?  
(Motion passed.)

Mr. CAKOUNES: Okay. And now they are approved minutes. The rest of the Assembly is welcome to read them and get into specifics of what happened.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you, Leo. Do we have a Report from the Clerk?

#### Report from the Clerk

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes. Not too much today but I just want to remind everyone that Finance Committee, the Standing Committee on Finance, will be meeting next Wednesday at 2 o'clock. And that's to review the segments in the budget that they have an oversight over.

And at 4 o'clock there will be a Public Hearing related to the Proposed Ordinance that was delivered today by the County Administrator.

So 2 o'clock Finance, budget items; 4 o'clock, Public Hearing.

And as far as everything else goes, we've just been chugging right along. Today we had another committee meeting related to budget matters.

We've already had Natural Resources, Economic Affairs and today we had Health and Human Services. So we're moving right along with that regard.

And that's all I have to report today.

Ms. KING: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. KING: Could I just have -- what was the Ordinance that was submitted just so I know what it's for and if I want to come to the Public Hearing?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. KING: Thank you.

Clerk O'CONNELL: It is for supplemental appropriations. One is under County Services, which is for the Dredge, and the other is under Public Safety which is for Fire Training Academy Salaries.

I did have the chance to watch the Commissioners meeting this morning. I knew that this was going to be coming over. And my understanding, please don't quote me on it, is that I think there was a problem with a pump on the dredge. I think they lost a pump. And this

supplemental appropriation is to pay to replace that.

And on the other, Fire Training Academy, I think they had additional, I want to say, applicants or students, but it sounded as if the income from this, the revenue that it was going to generate, is going to be greater than the cost but this is how you have to deal with it when you have the that additional expense.

And that's all I know so far.

Ms. KING: Thank you.

### Other Business

#### Recommendation from Charter Review Committee on Executive Branch:

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Under Other Business, recommendations from Charter Review Committee on Executive branch.

There was some discussion as to whether we should bring this up again, but we did vote to table it, so now it's being untabled.

It was part -- it was one of the recommendations made by the Charter Review Committee on reorganization of County government. I think it passed 4 or 5 or some, one with Bill absenting, Bill Doherty.

I heard from our counsel, Mike Curran, who's been a little under the weather for the last week or so. He lost his voice so he really wasn't able to participate in our last meeting.

And he thought that it was worth pursuing this if not in the immediate future then somewhere down the road because, in his opinion, County governments are moving more toward a centralized organization than we have here with the division of authority.

So I don't know what the members of the committee -- Julia's here and also Suzanne would like to pick up on this, but it was at the time part of, of course, a larger recommendation to change the entire organization of County government.

And also I think we have to consider that the Commissioners within the last year have appointed an Administrator, a separate Administrator which we haven't had for a while.

So, anyway, Julia, would you like to pick up on this?

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I had spoken at that last Charter Committee meeting and thought that it might not be worthwhile pursuing.

But having read Mr. Curran's letter, I think it is something that we should bring up again at the Charter Committee meeting.

I wouldn't, at this time, move it to bring it from the table for us to vote on here, but I'm open to further consideration.

I guess my -- just to be clear -- my thinking at the time a few weeks ago when we had the meeting and I said that I didn't feel we needed to pursue it is that I knew that it was not -- an elected Executive was not the direction that the Commissioners were going. They were more interested down the road in an appointed Administrator, which we have now, at least a temporary one. And I didn't see another great constituency for this and so I felt, eh, do we need to try and pursue it.

But I would like to -- I respect Mr. Curran's views and I would like to discuss it at a meeting and hear his discussion further.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. TAYLOR: Because I still think it is a good idea. I only didn't want to pursue it because I didn't feel it was necessarily going to be very popular. But, you know, I'm willing to

do unpopular.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Well, you know, if you want to talk about the Executive position once again, I don't have a problem with someone wanting to bring it forward. Everyone knows my personal standpoint on it, and I don't think its appropriate today for me to get into that or not. If we're going to talk about that in the future, fine.

However, I would like to comment on Mr. Curran's letter of March 2, 2014. I believed it was emailed to the Charter Review Committee, and subsequently because it's a public document was -- it ended up in my hands electronically.

When I read this letter and I encourage all of the members of the Assembly to read it, and when you do read it, try to not remember who it's coming from. And then let me know or think about how you feel about it after you've read it.

This letter comes from or it seems like it's coming from an individual who is giving their opinion on what they personally feel the County should be doing as far as County government goes.

This does not appear to be a letter from an attorney who is hired by us, this body, the Assembly, to represent us in the process. This letter comes off as if he's a member of the Charter Review Committee. Quite frankly, giving his personal opinion that we need to move forward on creating this position because it's in the best interest of the County.

I won't even bother getting into quoting it because each and every paragraph reads his personal opinion that we need to move forward and do this. Because after 25 years, it would be wrong to not do anything.

I really don't know what word to use as far as this counsel being our counsel. I think it's inappropriate for an attorney to write a letter in this manner, and I think it's inappropriate for town counsel -- any counsel, County Counsel, to be acting in this manner. He's there to advise us what we should be doing.

If he feels that this is a time-sensitive commitment, then one sentence would've been sufficient from an attorney.

If the Assembly -- if the Charter Review Committee wants to move forward with a single Executive, do it quickly because there is a time-sensitive thing to this, not the text of this letter.

I don't know what the outcome is going to be of it. I don't know what kind of -- I just have to -- I'm so upset I have to get it on record. I'm really, really disappointed that this stand has been taken.

Now if you want to talk about the rebringing off the table the Executive branch, that certainly can be done at a later date.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I think that Michael Curran deserves a tremendous amount of respect for his expertise and his years and years and years of contribution to Charters and County government.

I think the Charter Review Committee had a working collaborative or has a working collaborative relationship with him. And I think there are a lot of times even though he was an attorney, we would point-blank ask him for his advice, and his opinion, and his experience. And he was a huge contributor to educating me and many other people who did not have the history or the experience of Charter -- of County Charters.

I think that the discussion that the Charter Review Committee had last week was based on the fact that we thought that our opinions were that an Executive might be something that

would be just redundant and how it would fit in to the current structure because we don't have a new structure.

I think that letter came from what he would have said to the Charter Review Committee had he been there, and that would have been perfectly appropriate and reasonable and in keeping with how this committee has worked with him in the past.

And I think that its unfortunate people are getting upset about this because I think he has some very valuable ideas and very valuable -- a wealth of experience to offer.

We don't always take his ideas or his experience but we are certainly happy to hear them. So I view this as just one more information piece, one more part of the group weighing in.

And, yes, he is the attorney, but what we are going to use him for besides his experience is also to put the legal language, tighten that up and put language in in a proper format.

My bigger concern is the first part of this letter where he says that the Charter -- that as written and currently implemented was never really implemented properly.

So maybe that's the issue we should be looking at is looking at the Charter and whether it's being implemented properly from its inception.

But I would just respectfully disagree with the Delegate from Harwich because I did not feel that that was an unusual or inappropriate working situation with Attorney Curran.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Yes, Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. File it under for what its worth it was fascinating to read this letter. It was a surprise but also listening to him at some of your meetings was a surprise. Because my experience usually with counsel is they listen to you tell them -- tell counsel what you want and then they help you achieve it.

Right from the beginning I think he took a much more activist role and it appears probably because he's got a personal investment in the Charter from the very first day.

I don't know him and I wouldn't want to say anything that sounded less than respectful, but I have to say if his opinion is to be taken at its word, which is he thinks that the Charter has not been implement correctly in 25 years, then I guess I'd say it's kind of too bad that something wasn't done about it 24 years ago.

Because this is an awful long time later to say to everybody involved in County, "Gee, you're not following the Charter."

And the fact that there's not any kind of Charter enforcement mechanism was certainly noted by me and a number of us three years ago when we had questions about the relationship between the Assembly and the Executives.

So, on we go. I think more germane is the issue in front of us which is what to do with this recommendation from Charter Review. And after I read the minutes of the meeting, I've listened to all of you, and it seems to me that it would be very helpful, Ron, if the committee itself could send us a clearer message, meaning that when they took their first vote it was a package vote.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. ANDREWS: Now being aware of where we are now, how do they feel about this particular recommendation? Do they feel it stands okay? Do they still support it on its own or without the other piece? Clarity on that issue would be helpful.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I spoke to -- it's hard for me to think about the letter because I spoke to him on the phone, personally. I'm not a very good typist, so when I had to respond to him, I usually pick up the phone.

And so on the discussion I had with him, I told him that the sense of the meeting was that

he should go ahead and review the Charter for any defects that he felt about --. You know, when you think if you look into the current Charter, you see there's a process to change the Charter that doesn't require going to the Legislature. We've done that before, just about in every Charter Review we've had. There was some -- they have to go to the ballot but it doesn't have to go to the Legislature.

So I was asking him to make recommendations. If you want to take a yellow marker or something, you know, and go over -- I think that's what he said.

And when he's finished with that and he's ready to make some further recommendations to the Charter Review Committee, we'll meet again and we could take up this matter at that point.

There are just two things. First of all, I disagree with Leo. I mean I think Attorney Curran was hired not just to be an attorney but he was also hired to be an advisor because he was -- he had expertise in the Charter review.

I mean if I go to a surgeon and he sits down and says, "Well how do you want me to set your leg?" You know, I would go to another surgeon. That's why you go to him because he knows what he's doing.

So I think that his advice has been very helpful. And I think that Leo would find him more of an ally than an adversary because, as you probably read in his remarks, he feels that the Assembly should have far more authority within the County governmental structure than it does.

In other words, we should assert that authority. You know, we've been battling back-and-forth over various things but in his opinion and mine, and I think the majority of the Assembly of Delegates, this is a co-equal branch of government.

With the Commissioners, we should be brought into advisement on just about every policy change and every decision that is made. So I don't know if we're going to get there but that's what he thinks.

So, yes, we could discuss it again. The other thing is, and I don't want to go off too much on this, is that if you remember from the inception of this discussion there was a feeling that out in the community there was a desire for change from the League of Women Voters, from the O'Leary committee and so on and so forth.

So I felt and I know that some of the other members felt that we should give it all due consideration and respect for those people which we did.

Now when it came down to it, the committee did a good job. They made some recommendations; I didn't necessarily agree with them, but we brought it before the Assembly and the Assembly chose not to go forward, and I think it was probably the right decision because by that time the recommendations of the committee were meeting such a head wind from various parts of the community that even though there may have been still significant support for change, it wasn't going to go anywhere.

I've been told by those who would be on the receiving end of this that unless we were united, Commissioners, the Assembly and the community in making these changes it wasn't going to go anywhere. So it's probably just as well.

But I don't think that those who advocate for change are going to stop. I don't know if there's anything being brought up by the Commissioners or by anybody else but it's quite possible.

So I just think that this issue is going to continue and it's going to be revisited either voluntarily by us or not voluntarily. Anyway, that's my -- Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: We if the Charter Review Committee is going to meet again and

discuss things, I would respectfully request that they at least revisit the five County Commissioners and one strong town-appointed County Administrator as part of their review even if it just entails someone bringing it up and shooting it down.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We'll give it all the consideration it merits, Leo.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: May I?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: I have one other request. This is what I said when the Part 1 was up that if anything comes before us that it come in some kind of form other than a "Rough Discussion, Draft 2" so that we know exactly what's being presented and what we are voting on.

Thank you.

#### Assembly of Delegates Proposed Web Policy:

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Anybody else on this?

All right. I want to move to the Web Policy. Janice, I, and County Counsel have had discussions on the Web Policy and what should be included. And she's continued those discussions with our attorney. And I'll turn it over to her and she can let you know what's going on.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Delegates probably recall back several months ago we had some brief discussion with regards to our Web policy and what we should be placing on the Web.

There are some problems that are created when you just put everything on the Web. And at the time we talked about what the state recommends which is basically the minutes, agendas, and laws.

There was some comments made relative to this basic recommendation that seems to be a very low bar and can't we do a little more than that to be more transparent and helpful to the public with finding things that may assist them when they look at our agendas, presentations and things that happened at the Assembly; what else can we include?

So I did talk to County Counsel. We put together a draft, a proposed Web Policy, consulted with the Speaker, and what you have before you is what we have come up with.

I can tell you that it's certainly more than basic or minimum; more than what the state requires. It does give the Speaker leverage to sort of overrule whatever I'm doing and placing on the Web per the policy. If he feels that there is something so compelling that has been submitted that it should go on the Web because it's going to be helpful to the public and anyone else that needs to try to figure out what we're doing then he can request it be placed on the web.

It includes obviously the bare minimum, the laws, the agendas, and minutes. It includes the ordinances, and reports that committees generate. It could be a document from the state. It could be other documents from the County.

The rationale behind that being if these documents are coming from other government entities and we're using them here at the Assembly, one would think that there isn't anything contained in those documents that could get you in trouble in a court of law.

With regards to other items that people bring in and want to submit and deliver to the Assembly, I, as the Clerk, will have those documents in my office. Those will be available to people who want copies of them. They won't be available on the Web, but individuals will be able to email me, come to the office and say that as a public record and a document that they're allowed to have, "Can I get a copy of that? Can I see that document?" That's not going to

change.

But as far as it going up on the Web, it won't be there. It's only going to be the documents that are basically reiterated in this particular policy.

Am I comfortable with? Yes, I'm very comfortable with it because I think it protects the County, it protects the Delegates and it's manageable. In my opinion, it makes -- it's logical and it makes good common sense, but that's me and that's my opinion.

So that's it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Cheryl. How much longer are you going to be with us, Cheryl?

Ms. ANDREWS: I'm not going anywhere.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I don't know. The rumors are rife.

Ms. ANDREWS: Well, that's a different -- that's Monday night. That's not Wednesday afternoon.

I don't really want to take issue so much with the policy. I didn't understand it in the beginning. I'm getting a lot clearer on what the concern is.

But I wanted to just point out one thing. What's been very different for me as a Delegate from being a Selectman was that the minutes get taken verbatim. I wasn't used to that.

And so how I read -- what you call the minutes is very different from what I'm used to back at town which is more a motion minutes. Ours has every word that is uttered.

So what it means is if someone walks in with a statement and reads it, it's in the minutes. But if they walk in and summarize it and hand it in and you don't want to put it in, it's not.

And I'm pointing that out to you only because especially what happened recently, I read the minutes for the committee meeting I missed which was --

Mr. CAKOUNES: Natural Resources.

Ms. ANDREWS: -- Natural Resources. In it the Executive Director of the Cape Cod Commission stated that a member of the public -- what the member of the public was saying was false. That's a pretty strong statement.

So me, being the inquisitive one, I thought, well, gee, I wonder what he said that Paul was saying was false. And I read the minutes and it didn't really say. But it referenced a statement that was handed in. So I called you and I said, "Can I read the statement?"

The statement was rather bland too. I was surprised there was hardly anything in it. So the implication for me was that a bunch of stuff must have been said at the meeting that wasn't in the minutes and isn't in the statement.

Ms. ANDREWS: No?

Mr. CAKOUNES: Absolutely not.

Ms. ANDREWS: So maybe what the Executive Director was talking about was outside of the scope of the meeting? I mean I just -- I thought it was a really strong statement coming from Paul.

And I get what you're doing. I guess we're just going to have to be a little bit aware if we do word-for-word minutes but then sometimes we don't. If you're going to go with not-verbatim minutes, sometimes maybe less is better, in other words just (finger snapping.)

So I'm just saying as someone who consumed that piece, it certainly left me a little confused.

Thanks.

Speaker BERGSTROM: You know, we had this debate in Chatham once, and I said, you know, we're recording the meeting. I mean everybody can watch everything that we say. And

for some reason, and I don't know if it's still the rule, the state doesn't accept that as a minute. You actually have to submit minutes, written minutes.

Ms. ANDREWS: That's -- and we went through that and that's largely because sometimes you can't hear what people are saying when you watch the video. And I think our committee meetings aren't videotaped; is that fair? Right; ours?

Mr. CAKOUNES: Correct.

Ms. ANDREWS: Natural -- right.

Okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Would anybody else like to address this? Yes, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: A couple things. I think your concerns are well met, my fellow colleague from Provincetown, because I think the process works. I think that if someone does submit something in writing, although that may not be on the Web, it is available for the public to ask for it. So I think that works there.

Specifically to that meeting, I will tell you that we normally don't allow public to have comment during our little subcommittee hearings and stuff like that. But this individual asked, stood up, actually read the document, handed it in, and I believe almost immediately left. So I'm not really sure what -- you may want to contact Paul and ask him directly on that, but that's another issue.

In regards to the policy in front of us, I want to actually again say this is why we need all of our Delegates here because I so miss my Delegate from Wellfleet -- I mean Truro because she helps me with my legal stuff. Even though she's only less than 1 percent of the vote, she's a very helpful member here.

The very first one is the only one that I had a comment on that I think, and I'll just put it out there that maybe the Clerk can ask the attorneys if it would be appropriate.

It just states that the Barnstable County Charter and other official documentation of Barnstable County -- I added the word in there, "And other adopted official documents of Barnstable County."

Just kind of being specific that these are documents, like the Charter, they've been adopted; they've been approved. They are, and maybe I'm being a little too much on this legal. That's why I wish Deb was here, she would help me if it needs to be there or not.

But it's just being a little bit more specific on what we intend on being an official documentation of Barnstable County. It was a document that was actually adopted, maybe adopted is the wrong word, maybe approved, and I'll just allow maybe for my comments to go to the Clerk and maybe she can run it by Town Counsel to see if it's necessary or not.

But other than that, I think the documents great.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Leo, if the current policy gives me the discretion of putting anything on there I think is germane, I certainly would put any documents that are in effect, you know, that affect the business of the County. And if you can point some out to me or if anybody else has something that should be on there rather than somebody's dealing with a specific, you know, ordinance or a resolution.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I think it could mean documentation such as the Manual of Governance because I'm not sure that's on there now. I know the Charter is, but I'm thinking along those lines.

Because then as we get further on in the document, it gets a little more specific with regards to other types of documents that are being generated by either the County, might be a presentation or a letter that comes from the state with regards to a subject matter.

And, again, this is a policy really that only pertains right now to the Assembly because I don't believe the Executive branch has a policy yet for what they put on the Web.

So we're being a little bit, kind of like out there in front, a little pre-emptive in kind of doing this.

Mr. CAKOUNES: If I may, Mr. Chairman? That's exactly -- when I read that line, that's exactly what I assumed that it was meant by it. That's why I thought it would help to add some kind of a definition, whether it be approved or adopted official document, so that someone a year from now can't say, "Oh, what do you mean? This is an official document." It really specifies more what we're looking for. The Charter, policies and procedures, things like that.

But, again, if it's nitpicking, that's fine.

Clerk O'CONNELL: So that would be like "adopted" instead of "official." Adopted documentation -- adopted?

Mr. CAKOUNES: Run it by the attorneys.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Well this can be amended -- yes.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: I just want to say I think that I remember we talked about this before and I think what is presented here is a nice balance that manages expectations of what people should -- will know is there. It's very clear. It goes beyond the baseline of what's required, which I think is helpful for being transparent and engaging people, and I think it's a manageable set of information because the reality is the stuff has to get up there.

So, I think it's good. My questions is any other action -- would we have to do something with this or?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, you know, we could vote to adopt it. I mean there's kind of a gray area here. I mean basically the Clerk and I and the attorney determine what we could put on the Web.

But if you want to take a vote on this with the understanding that, you know, you could amend it at any point, I would be more than happy to entertain that, so we give it some kind -- so nobody could complain.

Yes.

Ms. ANDREWS: To the extent that anyone isn't clear at home, what I'm hearing coming from you folks is simply the goal of putting as much important information up on the Web as possible, which is wonderful thing. I think the County has improved immeasurably in the last couple years about that, with a little bit of discretion. That makes sense too.

So it sounds very workable and I don't anticipate you getting any kind of complaint about it. And if you do, then we can talk about then. But I think it sounds all very reasonable.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. So do we want to adopt this? Make a motion to adopt this as the official --

Mr. KANAGA: So moved.

Ms. TAYLOR: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Any further discussion? Okay. All those in favor? Aye. Okay. (Motion passed.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: I don't know if that vote will make it to the Web or not. It may not make the cut.

So, well, okay, is there any other business to be brought before the Assembly?

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: Motion to adjourn.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. All those in favor, say “Aye.”

**Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn the Assembly of Delegates at 4:35 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O’Connell, Clerk  
Assembly of Delegates