

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT
ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES**

APPROVED Journal of Proceedings - May 21, 2014

Speaker BERGSTROM: Good afternoon. Welcome to the May 21st session of the Cape Cod Regional Government, Assembly of Delegates.

Is anyone recording this meeting besides our normal recording?

Okay. The meeting is being recorded, so you have fair warning.

Okay. Well, I'll call this meeting to order, and we'll 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: The Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call (90.33%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham),

James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich),

Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Anthony Scalse (4.55% - Brewster), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Absent (9.67%): Leo Cakounes (5.67% - Harwich – arrived at 4:05 p.m.), Ned Hitchcock (1.27% - Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, we have a quorum with 90.33 percent of the Delegates present; 9.67 percent absent.

Committee of the Whole

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you.

I'll now need approval of the Calendar of Business.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: So moved.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Moved and seconded. All those in favor, say "Aye." Opposed? (Motion carried.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: You should have received a copy of the Journal of May 7th, 2014. Are there any additions or corrections to the Journal?

Hearing none.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: Move to Accept.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Moved and seconded. All those in favor say "Aye Opposed? (Motion carried.)

Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Now we have communications from and discussion with the Board of Regional Commissioners. We have two of our Commissioners right here.

Commissioner FLYNN: Good afternoon. It wasn't on, so I'll say good afternoon again.

I just wanted to say a couple of things. One is that I'm sure you know each year in West Barnstable through the Tales of Cape Cod and Lou Cataldo and others that each year they have a Mercy Otis Warren Award, and usually the Commissioners -- we don't normally participate in it, but we do participate in the evening when the awards are given.

And this year, Sheila Lyons happened to nominate Mary Lou Petit for this award. I think everybody knows Mary Lou Petit. And after 41 applications or 41 -- what do you call them?

Commissioner LYONS: Nominations.

Commissioner FLYNN: Nominations, the Tales of Cape Cod is going to award it to Mary Lou Petit.

Commissioner LYONS: Great.

Commissioner FLYNN: So I think that's really great and I thought you should know that. That occurs on June 9 right down here at Tales of Cape Cod near the old jail. And it's in the evening, and I think anyone who can go, Mary Lou would really love it because she was so very much a part of this Assembly for many years and along with the Lower Cape Cod Collaborative.

And also she was on the Special Commission that was put together by Henri Rauschenbach and Rob O'Leary, and she contributed a great deal to that. So I'm really pleased to see that she will be honored in that way.

The other thing I want to mention is that in the last two weeks, we have suffered the loss of one of our employees, Lee Manillo. She worked for 12 years in the Health and Environment Department with George Huefelder. She was 41 years old, and she had just given birth to twins. And in the next day there were complication and she passed away. And the funeral services for her were in West Falmouth.

And then a few days later, a recent hire by the Cape Cod Commission, Garry Meus, another young woman, also from that area, from the area of Bourne/Wareham/ Falmouth, also passed away from cancer. And so her funeral was this past Saturday in North Falmouth at Elizabeth Seton Church.

And I attended both, and I was really just -- had a feeling of -- I didn't exactly know what to think when I saw all these young people coming together and there were many, many, many people there, overflowing, even the church was overflowing. They grew up on the Cape. They went to school -- they went to high school on the Cape. Each of them -- I don't think they knew each other but they were of similar age. And they grew up here, and they worked here. They married and had children here. Jen, who was the wife of our Cape Cod Commission employee, they together had four-year-old twins also.

So, it was a very sad week. And it makes you think twice about a lot of things, but also about how important it is to keep our relationships in a way that are helpful and that are good and loving. So it was a very sad week.

Commissioner LYONS: I can only confer with that.

Commissioner FLYNN: And I don't want to take too much time because I know you have a lot to talk about this afternoon.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Do we have any questions for the County Commissioners? Well, thank you, very much.

Commissioner FLYNN: You're welcome.

Commissioner LYONS: Thank you.

Communications from Finance Director Mark Zielinski

Speaker BERGSTROM: We will now move on. Do we have any communications from -- oh, we now have Communications from Finance Director, Mark Zielinski, regarding the fiscal year '15 budget. Mark.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: So, I just want to mention, with all that said, that Lee Manillo was a very special person. A very tragic happenstance, but there were a couple of excellent articles about her in the Cape Cod Times, one of them on Sunday morning. So you'll get a nice flavor about what Lee was all about if you read those.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So we received -- you all should have received a copy of Mark's response to some questions we posed at the last meeting. Hopefully, you've had a chance to look at that.

He's graciously agreed to come before us and answer any further questions we have or to discuss anything you want to discuss on the fiscal year '15 budget. So with that, --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Let me just sort of preface --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Do you want to start out --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: I just want to preface. So, thank you, Janice, because if not for you then I would probably be home having a beer or something right now. I really mean that truthfully.

No because on Thursday morning, you're sort of picking up all the pieces and trying to figure out under the Charter what has to happen. So you realize there's no time for a resubmission of an Ordinance because the Ordinance was just voted down. So it has to be a reconsideration. So that's where we are today.

But then Janice also worked on these questions which tried to surmise what some of the issues were that maybe resulted in the budget being voted down.

So Michael Brillhart, myself, Billy Travers, we worked on -- and Maggie Downey worked on putting the answers to these questions together for you. I don't have a whole lot to add to them, but I'd be happy to answer any questions you have.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Okay. But I mean the gist of it, as I understand it, is the expenses of the Cape Light Compact as far as personnel and benefits are paid out of the County account, but it's not -- it's a separate line of disbursements and revenues then our budget that we see. In other words, we don't see --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Correct. They're not comingled in that sense. They're kept separate and distinct.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And the Cape Light Compact does contribute towards expenses according to your response here?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well, they pay their own salaries. They pay their own fringe benefits. They pay their own pieces. Their phone system, their call center, they pay for that directly so.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And they say they have paid approximately 60,000 towards the County's IT infrastructure.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Correct. Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So a one-time capital expense?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Correct. Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And also they are under consideration in their budget. I know they met today. They're talking about a flat fee of 2,000 a month for IT support and some other -- something else here. Anyway, with that, I'll open it up to discussion.

Yes, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Thank you. Mark, you and I have spoke, but I want to just kind of go over some stuff and make available for the rest of the Assembly members to hear what I've already heard, but I need to really understand it better myself.

I had two issues that I was concerned about in the current budget, and I want to address them separately. Although they seem to come together, they are two entirely separate issues.

The first one, you two gentlemen have already touched upon. And you mentioned to me or I left our phone conversation understanding that Cape Light Compact has their own checking account number.

And I want to kind of understand that whole procedure better because -- and for those of you that don't know where I'm going with this, I see two ways of accounting. One is to have an actual, absolutely different checking account number issued by the bank. And the second would be to have one bank account with our accounting system allocating account numbers to the departments as we do in our budget book.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Right.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Every department has an account number, yet it has nothing to do with the bank. There's only one bank account.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Right.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Or a few but there's only one that we're going to talk about it today.

So my first question in regards to the employment of employees of Cape Light Compact, these members -- these employees actually receive a Barnstable County check?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Correct.

Mr. CAKOUNES: On a weekly or biweekly basis?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Biweekly, like everybody else.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Just like everybody else. When that check is cashed by the employee, the money is taken from Barnstable County's checking account?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: A payroll checking account, correct.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Correct. Okay. At some point, weekly/biweekly, I'm not asking when because --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Biweekly.

Mr. CAKOUNES: The Cape Light Compact --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Prior to the day that that check is cashed; otherwise, you have other problems.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Writes you a check or writes the County a check and those checks are deposited in the General Fund?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: It's not done through a check for those. So when payroll does their payroll, we know that Cape Light Compact is this much; Cape Cod Commission is this much; the County General Fund is this much. Anybody else having grant salary drawn on a grant account because we usually -- we set up -- not usually, we do set up a special revenue account for every individual grant because most times the granting authority wants you to track

those all separate.

So those are all in little separate accounts in the MUNIS system, usually in a separate fund.

Mr. CAKOUNES: In-house accounts?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: In-house accounts.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Okay.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: And then once payroll does that, we know exactly, so, you know, 200,000 comes from the General Fund, 50,000 from the Cape Cod Commission, and I'm making these numbers up, and 25,000 from the Cape Light Compact. Those monies are transferred out of their funds and accounts into the one checking account. It's a payroll account. And all the payroll checks are drawn off that one account.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Okay. With that said, and now understanding that process, it was my intention to want to see that specific transaction in the County's budget because as someone who's up here representing Barnstable County has a fiduciary responsibility to Barnstable County, I think that the budget should reflect that there is monies going out to employees of Barnstable County and that money is going out and it is being reimbursed by these companies that are on the hook for those salaries.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: And it's -- I don't spend -- I don't spend County money on Cape Light Compact's salaries. I spent Cape Light Compact money on Cape Light Compact's salaries. It's not a reimbursement.

Mr. CAKOUNES: But is --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Even if you're sort of confusing the cash with the budgeting, they're two distinct and separate things. We don't budget the Cape Light Compact monies. The State and DPU and DOER, they do that.

And, in fact, when we had the Sheriff, there was a specific prohibition about not subject to further reappropriation because, you know, what these higher authorities were granting that money for a specific purpose are afraid of is that unscrupulous County Commissioners and unscrupulous Selectmen or unscrupulous others will use it for some other purpose.

So they sort of don't like subject to further appropriation.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Can you give me another example of a County employee that receives a County check that we do not have them somewhere listed in the County budget?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: The gentleman who runs the Base septic system.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I'm sorry; the Base?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: You know they have the test center at the Base? That is their own funding stream and their own, you know, funding mechanism but he's a County employee, works under George's auspices. He's not in the budget.

None of the Sheriff's employees were ever in the budget. They're just all in special revenue funds. That's just how they are.

Anybody who's paid under a grant, their grant pieces may not be in the budget. That just how we've done it.

Mr. CAKOUNES: The grant incomers would not be in the budget? If the County's receiving a grant income, you wouldn't have it in --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Some of them are and some of them aren't. The ones we know about when I do the proposed budget in February, they're in there. But if I don't know about them, they're not in there.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Just a general comment. I have a problem with that procedure, and I

may be wrong but I feel that if there are people receiving a County check and they are, in fact, County employees and they are getting all the County benefits whether its health benefits or even in the future OPEB benefits, eligible for those, that somehow the budget should reflect that. I mean you may disagree.

I believe at this point it's a budgeting discussion, but I just for the life of me can't understand why there isn't a section in the budget which shows that and shows that so the next person sitting here, because, by the way, I won't be here next year, the next person sitting here will be able to open that budget and realize that there X amount of employees that are under the Cape Light Compact that are County employees.

They will realize that that gentleman that's running that Septic Betterment Program or Septic thing is a County employee.

The new person that's sitting here is going to have no way of knowing that knowledge unless they take it upon themselves to go out into the Internet to look at all these different organizations and try to figure out if they're, in fact, listed somewhere. And I just don't think that that's good.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: I would say, Leo, this goes back -- it precedes me, actually.

Mr. CAKOUNES: So a lot of things that were done that Leo doesn't agree with for a long time --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Right.

Mr. CAKOUNES: It doesn't make them right or wrong.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Right.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I'm just saying --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: This precedes -- my tenure will be 20 years in October. So, this goes way, way, way back. And I'm not sure whether it's '93 or '92 an Ordinance was basically passed that says grant stuffs not on the budget. So that's sort of --

Mr. CAKOUNES: And I don't disagree with that, and I don't disagree that it's right or wrong. But I will tell you that since I've been sitting up here, there have been things that have changed that are now disclosed, and I'm the only -- which many of the members that are here for a long time either knew about or had forgotten because it's not in the general public. But that's neither here nor there.

That's one reason why I can't support the budget though. I really believe, and I can't -- no one can give me an argument strong enough back again that's going to sway me and say that it does not need to be in the budget. I'm not saying we should have access to it. I'm not saying we should be able to say this person should or shouldn't be hired, but I just believe in true disclosure should be in the budget.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well --

Mr. CAKOUNES: Now the second part, if I can, we're going to agree to disagree on that.

The second part, if I can, Mr. Speaker?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Go right ahead, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: The second part of my situation and my question, although it's comingled to this but it's an entirely different procedure, it is this cost allegation of workload that especially, and I don't mean to be picking on you, Mark, but especially your department happens to be burdened with.

You have employees under your control or direction that are performing duties for these other entities, three or four of them, and I feel that we should be at least looking at getting the

reimbursement for their time and possibly portions of their salary and health, whatever.

As was mentioned earlier in regards to the use of our IT, and I think you and I, once again, we discussed that also and you kind of made me feel good saying that you might want to look at this at least next year. You can't do it this year but maybe down the road?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well, I'm certainly open to the notion that there's some allocation or administrative fee considered to be charged to the Cape Light Compact, whoever it happens to be. I would say that's up to the County Commissioners. You know, it's up to them, and it's up to the County Commissioners and whoever is charged a fee that they're open to paying it, I guess. You can send all the bills you want and --

Mr. CAKOUNES: But they can go out.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: You don't want to include it in your budget if you don't think you're going to get it. That's not real responsible either but.

Mr. CAKOUNES: All right.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: So, yes, I'm certainly open to that notion. We do that with the state right now. We include an administrative charge. Some years they pay it; some years they don't pay it.

Mr. CAKOUNES: And it's in the budget?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: It's in the budget as the revenue from the court rental fee, yes.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Right. So we are doing it under some circumstances?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: We're doing it with the state because I have a lease agreement with the state that calls for us to do it that way.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Right.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: The Cape Light Compact Administrative Service Agreement is silent on it. And it's silent because at that time that Board of County Commissioners didn't consider charging administrative fee. That's not to say that wouldn't happen in the future.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Okay. On another matter, Mr. Speaker? I would just like to ask where we are in the open session before we convene. I understand there might be a pending motion to reconsider. And I was just wondering what the Speaker intends on using for a vote to pass that motion to reconsider.

I'm not sure if the Charter is clear on whether it is a simple majority or whether it's going to require a two-thirds majority.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I've got the -- we have the manual -- do we have the Manual of Governance in front of us? That's -- we took -- Janice would know because she discussed this with County Counsel.

Clerk O'CONNELL: It's a reconsideration and it's going to be a simple majority.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: But I don't think the motion to reconsider has to be a vote, just the main motion?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: I think it has to be, yes.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes. I was just going to pass this note to John and let him know that it's appropriate for the person who made the request to reconsider to make a motion to reconsider so that it puts Proposed Ordinance 14-01 back out on the floor for discussion and vote.

Mr. CAKOUNES: If it passes.

Ms. KING: If reconsideration passes.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well, maybe you should consider the alternative.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Just a point of information. If you're going to reconsider, don't you have to vote to do that?

Mr. OHMAN: Yes.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Yes.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay. So that's a simple majority to reconsider. If that passes, then there's -- then we discuss --

Speaker BERGSTROM: I'll take your word for it because I don't have the Manual of Governance in front of me right now that addresses that, but it's a good point.

Yes, Deborah, did you want to pipe in here?

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I just had a couple of things I wanted to explore with you.

First of all, this whole concept of comingling, you know, it's one of those things that they sort of drill into us in Law School. And, in fact, when they swear you in, they tell you the only thing you can't do is they say is "Don't comingle your funds," which generally means keeping your money and your client's money in the same bank account.

Now you're saying that that's a wholly different definition that you use because you keep your money and Cape Light Compact's money and who knows how many other people's money in one bank account; isn't that right?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Not necessarily, no. But the notion that for every fund that any town that you're sitting here representing has a separate bank account for each and every one of their funds, that doesn't happen. They keep it in one account. It's accounted for in their system separately and tracked in their system separately.

And then you have account balances, and you do your checking and you're balancing to make sure that the money that's supposed to be in that account went to what it was supposed to go to. That's the whole notion of accounting.

But you don't have, you know, separate checking accounts for separate payroll purposes. You have one payroll account and you have one accounts payable account.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I don't want to interrupt.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: That's just how it works.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It seems that that analogy, I mean, in the Town of Chatham, for instance, we have a bunch of separate funds but they all tie back to the central authority of the Selectmen in other words or their appointees. We're talking about --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Just like here.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We're talking about organizations have completely different responsibilities and the answer to completely different people. I mean Cape Light Compact we can't tell them what to do. Anyway, go ahead.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay. But let me just understand this because what I understood you to say, and maybe I was wrong and didn't hear you right, but I understand you to say that you did not feel that there was a need to share this accounting and what these other expenses were and what these income factors were.

For example, your payroll of other entities with us because you didn't comingle your funds.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: I never said that. When did I say that?

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Well, I think when you talked about it's -- early in this session -- okay. So let's just back up a little bit. The payroll account, for example, that you talked about,

we only get a part of that in our budget; is that right?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: That's right. Because your budget process is an authorization to appropriate money, to spend money, but you're not appropriating Cape Light Compact money. The state does that.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay. In terms of all of the people who work in the County for that entity, all of the work that is done, everything, you're saying that there's no reason for the County even though the fiscal agent did include them in its own accounting; is that right?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: It's in its accounting. It's not in its budgeting. There's a distinction.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay. Well, all right. I don't want to argue about that. I just have one more question for you. There's a 2-1/2 percent increase in the local, what's it called, the County tax assessment in this budget; is that right?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Correct.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: And that's only going to generate about \$70,000; is that right?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Correct.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: And we just heard from the accountant that last year there was a surplus fund of -- I'm not quite sure how much?

Mr. CAKOUNES: 1.6.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Excuse me?

Mr. CAKOUNES: 1.6 million.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: 1.6 million. Can you tell me why it was deemed necessary to increase the County tax assessment this year in this budget?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Because you're thinking that there's a million-six floating around somewhere that we haven't used for anything. But if you recall, when you got the year-end report back in August, that million-six was divvied up into reserve accounts.

So it's all in the reserve accounts that we've set up. We don't have -- we've chosen over the past few years not to use remaining balance funds at the end of the fiscal year in next year's budget because you can get into a bad habit. You get used to it being there, and when it's not there, and then you've got to cut the budget.

So, that's what we've chosen to do over the past few years.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: All right. I understand what your distinction is, but I still don't understand why that necessitated a tax increase.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well, it's permissible under the statute, the 2-1/2 percent. And if we didn't increase that, then you'd have to cut the budget by 70,000 or whatever that number was.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Well, it would be reasonable to expect given the past year and the year before that, and the year before that, and the year before that you had at least \$70,000 to put into your reserves at the end of the year; isn't it?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well, we had surpluses and we were all fighting over money about where it would go and what it would be used for and whether it would go back as cash to the towns or.

We didn't increase the County tax. We went through a period of I don't know how many years that we didn't increase the County tax and that was the policy. We didn't increase the County tax.

And for that period of time that we did that, cost us really what -- where the County tax would be now, what is it about 2.7-2.8, I can't remember, it would be a million dollars more

because we choose not to increase it by 2-1/2 percent each of those years so.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: I mean the other thing I'd say are we keeping arguing about OPEB or we keep talking about OPEB. What are we going to do about OPEB? Well, then, you know, 70,000 to OPEB at the end of the year. There you go.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We'll get to Julia here.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I was just going to say Falmouth has had quite a rigorous program of trying to increase its reserves. So, yes, we had that so-called extra money that we felt was very important to budget in reserve funds that we're allowed to do.

But I don't think it ever crossed anyone's mind in Town Hall that we would not go ahead with the 2-1/2 percent override. And the increase that we're allowed to have also because as we all know expenses do -- have risen more than 2-1/2 percent in most towns.

The other point I think is important to remember that there is an actual agreement between the County and Cape Light Compact, for example that spells out what the responsibilities are for the County to do this work.

I don't think it's unreasonable to think that we could change that agreement or we could suggest changes. But having that agreement to do certain tasks for them is not at all the same as appropriating County money for their operations. Those are two entirely separate things and that's why this budgeting issue -- it doesn't appear in the budget because we don't appropriate money to them. We just perform certain tasks.

I think it might be worth inquiring as to whether we could charge more for those tasks.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Or charge period, I guess I would add.

Ms. TAYLOR: Charge period.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Yeah, charge period. And I would add that Julia's absolutely right. But also this isn't new. I don't know what year we're in that we haven't included the Cape Light Compact in the budget. But remember however many years ago that was, it was included in the budget because it was getting County money at that point in time.

Ms. TAYLOR: And it was in the budget.

Speaker BERGSTROM: John, did you want to get in here?

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly. I just want to be perfectly clear about this regarding the payroll process. You're following accepted municipal County standards for when you do this, accounting standards; there's sort of a pass-through. All this is is your general accounting, your general payroll account is -- you accept money --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: It's a clearing -- yeah, it's a clearing account basically.

Mr. OHMAN: A clearing account basically.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: That's where your check clears.

Mr. OHMAN: All the account -- all of the money that goes to the Cape Light Compact's expenses are put in and the exact amount to the penny is (Inaudible) on it on a biweekly basis?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: According to standard practices by law.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Yes. Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: So, to me, it's very clear. I just want to make sure that that's made clear to everybody here. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Mark --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: I don't think it's out of the ordinary about how towns do it either. And I'm sure the towns do it similarly.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, I mean the thing is that we are not the -- I mean our serving as the fiscal agent for Cape Light Compact and CVEC, that's an option. I mean we don't have to do it. Somebody else could do it; is that right?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: That's --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yarmouth could do it or Barnstable County would.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. The other thing, I went through Town Meeting --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Nobody else would want it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Nobody else -- well, I won't argue with you there. I'm sure that if you offered it around, you wouldn't get a lot of response.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Probably not.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I went to Town Meeting, and I'm sure a lot of people did here, and we had some articles from the Community Preservation Act. And one of the annual articles from the Community Preservation Act is a certain amount of money for administrative costs.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And it's written into the act. And this reimburses the town for the administrative costs of spending the money and so on and so forth.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So I think that what some of the Delegates are aiming at is a similar relationship with Cape Light Compact that the towns have with the Community Preservation Act, which is a recognition that there are administrative costs, for instance, your time and effort.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: That are involved in, you know, administering this out of the goodness of our heart and that that should be recognized.

I think Julia was headed in the same direction when she said that. I mean I don't want to suggest that Cape Light Compact has more discretionary funds than we do but, right now, they certainly have enough to maybe cover a reasonable amount for reimbursement for administrative costs.

I can understand where it would be difficult for you to go out and say, well, how many phone calls does this person answer and how many messages does the IT system the way they do it with the Community Preservation Act. It's a set fee that's agreed upon by all parties.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well, I would suggest, Ron that I don't -- and don't get me wrong, I'm not opposed to that. I'm in favor of it. I'm the finance guy. I like to take money in for the County. That's sort of what gives us the ability to do all these wonderful things that we do.

I just think that this discussion that we're having sort of Leo's thread is a good discussion for the FY 2016 budget. So we should sit down; we should figure out whether we do -- whether we, you know, analyze every phone call and every light bulb, as the State does, quite frankly.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well then --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Or whether we just say, you know what, how about 25 grand or 50, make up a number.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. But there are two budgets. We're talking about our budget. We're talking about the Cape Light Compact's and CVEC's budget. When do they do their budget?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well, you're not really talking about the CVEC budget because we're not really doing as much for them. You're really talking about the Cape Light Compact budget.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: So they're doing their budget today. They did their budget today for next year.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So, I mean, what I'm saying is they would have to agree to this?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: That's right. That's why --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Which comes first?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: This is why it's a good discussion for sort of fiscal year '16.

So, if Leo wants to volunteer and get that together with me, and we sit down and we say, all right, let's look at his payroll, and payroll is perfect to do by percentage of payroll. How much is their salary versus how much is everybody else's? That's a good way to do that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Now, does the County have a written agreement, in other words, the agreement we have as the fiscal agent, whatever you want to call it, with Cape Light Compact, is that a renewable agreement? Do we sign it every year?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: No.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No. It just keeps going?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Yes. It's just one agreement, so it would have to be amended. And what we would do is we'd come up with some proposal, here's a number or here's a methodology, you bring it to the County Commissioners.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Is that, I mean, is that part of the practice just to have an open-ended forever agreement. I mean you would think that most agreements like that would have a termination date in which case -- point both parties could consider whether they were benefiting from the agreement. I mean --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well we were doing a regional service then. Somehow down the road this became not a regional service, you know, I don't know where.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Now --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Maybe, you know, when they got all this money, it became, well, let's get a piece of that action. I don't know.

Speaker BERGSTROM: What happened is it became an issue as to what the County's oversight over these organizations were. And we went back and forth on that and we decided we had very little oversight. So it now becomes not a regional effort. It becomes a separate entity. I'm not going to argue that point, but that's where this whole thing started.

So, yes, Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: I'll keep it quick. Thanks, Mr. Speaker. And I think you're starting to get to exactly what I was thinking sitting here is that what's confusing is the concept of fiscal agent versus employer. Because you're trying to -- it sounds to me like you're trying to make a comparison to say a town's behavior, but I'm not aware of any town that has a bunch of employees but they're really not employees. But they are employees and their budget is bigger than the towns.

I mean this is where I think this all started was that, by definition, if these folks are

County employees and people have issue, and then we'd go to the County. And all of the sudden we said "No."

So I guess for me that fundamentally is where the concern is. It's that the check itself -- we're calling these people "Barnstable County Employees." And that sort of assumption, I guess, and maybe we never understood or I don't understand why they have to have a fiscal agent as opposed to just doing it themselves.

The assumption is that sometimes there are times when money in and money out doesn't balance and you're helping make it all work. And I get what you're saying about regional service.

But I guess I'd love to know why they can't be Cape Light Compact employees. And if they have to be Barnstable County employees, what exactly does that mean in terms of the County's responsibility to those employees? The bottom line is we have a relationship with these people. We may not have control over the dollars, but it is certainly part of the County's finances. And I think the problem is its very fun to focus on the word "Budget." That's not what we're talking about. We're talking about the County's financial -- overall financial picture. And by definition, if you cut out these sections, then we're not seeing the complete picture. And that is certainly a concern. I think that's why we're here.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yeah, Julia and then Pat.

Ms. TAYLOR: Just for as a historical note, long before we had this relationship as a fiscal agent for the Cape Light Compact, we had a very entangled relationship with the Sheriff's Department. And they were County employees; however, the money was coming from the state, and the Sheriff was a separate elected official yet he got a paycheck from the County. And, believe me, that -- when -- relationships was considerably more difficult and controversial and led to unbelievably unpleasant -- everyone tried to be nice.

But at any rate, it's a historical way that things have been done. Whether it's a good one or not I think is certainly open question. But it was not a -- we were very happy when the state finally did take over because there were tons of liability possibility issues, rah, rah, rah, rah, rah.

At any rate, I think that it is good to think though this wasn't some plot on the part of either Cape Light Compact or Mark's, you know, payroll department. It was the way these things have been done. And they could be changed if we have good reason for it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Pat, did you want to say something?

Mr. PRINCI: I just wanted to say briefly, Mark, thanks for all of your efforts and being so available throughout this process.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: I appreciate that, Pat.

Mr. PRINCI: One of the bonuses to this year for me, compared to last year, was the fact that we do have an Administrator now to allow you to spend more time with us.

But I was still a little perplexed by the lack of communication and process in a sense where there was at the last meeting there were members on the Finance Committee that apparently had asked you some questions about some things. They didn't get those answers prior to our expected vote on the budget, and the budget didn't pass based on to those members a lack of information.

I've had the experience of working with seven state budgets, and this budget is -- it was a lot harder for me to apprehend than a billion dollar state budget. It required last year a lot of me, and I want to thank other members like Leo, Ron, John, and some others that answered a lot of my questions that I did have regarding it.

And it also required me more so this year to have to go into all these other entity's

websites and then look at their budget and compare it to this budget. And it was confusing, but I was able to more or less figure things out.

What I would suggest for future budget proceedings, and it goes back to something that Mark had mentioned earlier, perhaps maybe this fall, under the Speaker's direction, some sort of workshop with yourself and maybe a County Commissioners so that we, as members, can let you know how we'd like to see some things, some break downs and so forth.

And another procedural matter that I think would be helpful would be a protocol as far as us getting information. If we need something, it's not nonchalant a question at a committee hearing. It's maybe a memo through our Clerk to you guys to the Commissioners and the Executive Office to get information back to our members.

I'm not sure how it would be best suited, but nonetheless, it should be done. And I think that in the future it would be a lot easier for us as members to help facilitate and move things along quicker.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well, I think those are good ideas. I know Marcia was at the Commissioners' meeting two weeks ago -- a week ago. And she had mentioned that there were questions that weren't answered. And I said I didn't realize that there were questions that were answered. I thought when Billy and I were up here, you know, however many weeks ago, we answered all of the questions.

So it is sort of a communication issue. If there are things that aren't getting answered that you feel that they're not registering in my head, then, yeah, I need to know about it. Because we don't want to leave things unanswered obviously.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I just want to get into just one thing that I want to follow-up on is that, you know, we discussed this. The Special Commission on County Government discussed this issue of having -- and it seems like we're beating up on Cape Light Compact, but it's a bigger issue.

What happens is the County has a myriad of organizations that are affiliated with us; the Cape Cod Commission jumps out, but there are others, Mosquito Control, there's the Wastewater which are paid for. In other words, their managed by the County but we don't have any authority over them and the Commissioners don't really have any authority over them either. I mean they have limited authority and they appoint people here and there. All of them have their own boards, you know, 15 members from the 15 towns on the Wastewater -- 15 members -- there are many members on the Cape Cod Commission.

And the issue, I mean, in Chatham and most of the towns on the Cape, they went through this 25 years ago. The Tree Warden was elected. The Planning Board was elected. The Finance Committee was appointed. We decided to go with a Town Manager, and we said, "We're going to put this poor sucker in here, and he's not going to have any authority over anybody because everybody's got their own little turf."

So it was decided then we got rid of all the autonomous organizations within the town. We had an organizational chart from top to bottom. And that's lacking in the County, and I think we recognize that. And I think the Special Commission recognizes that.

But, like I say, all these are set up either by law in case of the Commission or by Ordinance, in the case of other organizations. So now we're dealing fiscally with a lot of things that we -- we got rid of the Sheriff, no big loss. But we still are dealing with a lot of organizations that are doing their own thing, and we don't have any oversight on.

And I think that's really where the problem comes from, and, you know, checks, Leo, checks are coming and going but we're only seeing or really have authority over a number of

them.

So it's going to take, I think, you know, the Charter Review Committee only had a limited authority and a limited scope of service, but I think it's going to take another review.

And Commissioner Lyons wants to say something.

Commissioner LYONS: No. I just want to say something in regards to Cape --

You know when you're looking at the Cape Light Compact, especially for those of us and I have to put myself in here because this was all done when I was not even on Cape Cod.

However, if there was -- if there's questions about how did the Cape Light Compact become part of the County government, I think it would be very good for you to have Senator, you know, our former Senator Rob O'Leary who was Commissioner and actually established the Cape Light Compact, and maybe Scott Ridley to come and talk about what it was then and how it was attached because there was very little money. The budget of the County was even less then.

So they were trying to do great things for a region that wanted those things. And they were making it work, you know, by not eating, basically.

And the County has always put itself behind for the benefit of these regional projects or for even the towns. And when you think of the surplus, there could have been better ways to have thought about that. They were just Band-Aids given out to people as opposed to strategic planning and what happened to that.

So I encourage this Board to invite Rob O'Leary to discuss those days.

As far as if there is a budget and then maybe we kind of fill it in here, there's none of that. It's pretty black-and-white. What goes in; what goes out.

Also, being attached to a County government does lend itself to be open to public scrutiny. And that is one reason why it has always been attached so that there is a public accountability somehow. It doesn't mean that we administer it. It doesn't mean -- I mean we might do the administrative, but it doesn't mean we have power over it.

But there is an attachment there that makes it a public entity to public openness.

So I'm just suggesting that this is a good conversation. It does have a historical significance, and the people who are still with the Cape Light Compact were the original County employees. And that is sort of how they are the County, you know, that's how they continued. It's either that or you take away whatever they've built up.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sheila.

Commissioner LYONS: No, but I'm just saying there is an explanation to this and it's not just an assumption.

Just let me finish, Ron. So I just wanted to say that I think that that is a very good way for you to have an understanding of what was created and why it has remained this way.

And I just want to make one other point. The Cape Light Compact never came up --

Speaker BERGSTROM: This is a finance -- this is a budget discussion now.

Commissioner LYONS: I understand.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We're not talking about that.

Commissioner LYONS: But the reason that these budget questions came up was when turbines were introduced to this region.

Mr. CAKOUNES: That's not true.

Commissioner LYONS: Prior to that, there wasn't really a lot of questions about what did the Cape Light Compact offer and what did it do.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sheila, I'm just saying --

Commissioner LYONS: And maybe I'm wrong on that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: -- the reason Mark is here today is because it's not -- it's what we want to do is we want to get an idea the carrying cost of our providing these services. Now we're not saying that we're going to charge them. We just want to know what expense the County goes to by offering our service as the fiscal agent for these organizations, so that we can look at the budget and we can say, "Okay. Yes, it's a great organization. It helps" you know and "we'll eat whatever the cost is or when the Delegates feel we should be compensated." So it's a budgetary discussion.

I don't want to get into whether it's a good organization or not.

Commissioner LYONS: No, no. I'm not saying whether it's a good organization. I'm just saying the historical significance of it being part of the County. I'm not saying anything else. Because even this budget conversation, there's all these extraneous comments and assumptions being made of a beginning that may not be fully educated to it. That's all.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Why don't we let Theresa get in here; okay.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: I actually think Patrick had a very good idea. And I know he's talked about this in the past because there are a lot of entities that show up. And we talked (Inaudible) can we get a little grid of what is it? What is its role? Check, check, check, and then mapping it to what's in the budget.

And I think the history is nice but what's more important is what is the reality today that we're dealing with and how can we be sure we all understand what that reality is because I think that's where a lot of the problems come from.

So I think Patrick's idea is great. I'd be happy to be involved. And I think it's really important to do. And I think it will make things a lot saner the next round of these discussions.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Let me just answer Theresa because she's absolutely right. Because, Ron, you mentioned the Mosquito Control. We don't have anything to do with Mosquito Control.

The Special Commission proposed that we maybe take it under our umbrella, but right now that hasn't happened. So we really don't have anything to do with Mosquito Control. They're not part of the County, and they're not part of our budget. They're not part of anything so.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Suzanne and then Leo.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes. I don't think our issue has anything to do with what the Cape Light Compact does. Everybody's in agreement that they do a tremendous amount of work. It's how they do it. That's our question and our concerns. It's the transparency and lack of responsiveness in terms of information.

So one of the things that is lost in that lack of openness and responsiveness is what are the costs that the County is carrying because we don't know. We don't have that information. It's not just administrative costs. In all this, it might be OPEB cost. It blended in somehow because they have benefits and down the road we have this unfunded liability for all County employees. And, oh, by the way, are these County employees or are they not County employees?

So it's just we want to be able to be crystal clear on exactly what monies are where and what employees are where. And it's the lack of information and transparency that is the issue.

So it's not the history or anything like that. And no one thinks that the Cape Light Compact isn't doing great work. It's just my issue personally is I need to know more about how they're doing it.

They are under public scrutiny in accountability, but our experience has been that we have not had the transparency that we needed. And that's why the AG -- IG occurred, so just that.

I think for you, Mark Zielinski, you are a very clear, good presenter of a very complicated budget. You are also someone who is very willing to work with people, go along with people. A lot of our suggestions you are very agreeable to. And I think it might have been you're agreeable, "Oh yes we can do that" or "That sounds like a good idea" or "Yeah, that's no problem" that we took as I'll do that for you.

So I think what we need to do is say I'd like my capital budget separated every year. I'd like my costs allocated separate every year. Put it in writing, formalize it so that everybody knows exactly what it is that we are expecting.

You have been just very helpful, but I think maybe in that helpfulness we assumed that there were things coming that you were more putting on your future oh, I'll do that or I'll think about that. So I think that may be part of our issue. So let's just do that.

And then just a point to Julia about the Sheriff becoming so entangled. There have been many of times that I have wanted CLC to go away because I just feel like it's something that I can't get my head around and my arms around. Wouldn't that be easier for everybody?

But I just wanted to say it's not what CLC does. It's not the people. It's not, you know, not the good things. It's just trying to get our head around their numbers.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Leo. And we'll try to keep -- try to focus on the budget issues.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Absolutely. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just in response to Patrick's comment. I take a lot of that blame. And if you remember two weeks ago when we voted the budget, I specifically took a lot of the blame personally.

I don't have a lot of time this time of year. I was in contact with Mark a number of times. He and I were not able to sit down and speak either on the phone or in person. And I don't want to put the blame certainly on Mark for not being available. It was a personal thing for me too. I only have so much time that I can put into this volunteer position; Number 1.

Number 2, I take great offense that the statement was made that the reason why that we are asking about CLC and CVEC is because of some wind tower project.

Commissioner LYONS: No, my --

Mr. CAKOUNES: And I spent a lot of time reviewing this budget. I spent a lot of time, as you people know, here with policies and procedures for this County. I could give it a damn less about a wind tower in any town. Okay.

I have no personal opinion of them, nor was this brought to my attention because of a wind project, and I take offense to that. I worked very hard on this budget.

And I do look back at history because I feel that if you don't know history, you will repeat history. And as Mark's comments about, "Well, this is the way we've been doing it," that's one reason why I would like to see things changed because there is a better way of doing it.

Now to go back to my original comments, there are two issues that I have brought forward. I don't know what the rest of you feel, but the two issues that I've brought forward are separate in my eyes anyhow. One is the allocation and possible charging of our services to certain departments. I have said two weeks ago I did not anticipate that being in this budget, that I was at that time thinking of bringing forward a Resolution within the next two or three

meetings which would get the support of this Board to sit down and maybe put some kind of a procedure so we can work for our 2016 budget to see it happen then. Or bring forth some policy that we would bring forward in front of the County Commissioners for their review. I said that two weeks ago and I will say it again today. I still stand on that.

The second issue, however, is I still feel strongly that I would like to see in the budget, although we may not allocate the money or raise the money or spend the money, it is still County funds are being allocated, although they may be coming from somewhere else, the actual checks are being drawn from County funds for a minimum, the employment aspect of these organizations.

I know there are vehicles out there that are registered to the County. They need to be allocated and clearly spelled out in the budget. Although I agree we may not be spending County funds, they are an obligation of the County and that way I really feel they need to be in the budget.

I do want just briefly draw your attention to some time ago. There was a Senate Bill which was filed, 1715 Senate Bill, which actually was going to ask the County to bond for CLC because there was some problem with anticipated funds coming in. They were spending, if you will, or I won't even say they did spend, but they were anticipating on spending in the black down; right? That's bad?

Speaker BERGSTROM: In the red.

Mr. CAKOUNES: In the red, sorry. So we wanted to have a bonding issue brought forth. That bill has since been not voted on. It was sent to committee and has been killed.

That was one of the things that brought my attention to -- and I'll use our attorney's language although I'm not sure if it's correct or not, the comingling, if you will, of funds. So that, in fact, when one of these organizations happens to spend in the red, their checks didn't bounce. The County check didn't bounce, okay, it came from somewhere and it got covered. Granted that it was anticipated revenue coming in and that's fine.

But there's liability such as that and, again, I'm glad Mark is here to clarify it but they're not separate bank accounts. They are our account, and I strongly think that we need to see in our budget at least these allocations going out for the things that I mentioned, employment and automobiles, things that we're actually spending money on. And, I don't want to say receiving money, but I don't know I guess the term would be receiving; would it be okay to say that?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Uh-huh.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Through other line items?

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: And just for clarification, strictly you're not a volunteer. You're compensated for your time.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: You're an employee.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I'm an employee. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Anyway.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: You're an employee.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Mostly --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Notice (Inaudible).

Speaker BERGSTROM: It seems to me just to --

Mr. CAKOUNES: But I'm in the budget though.

Speaker BERGSTROM: To try to move this along, there are two issues here. One is the budget that's going to be in front of us for reconsideration, which, you know, we can argue as to what should be in it and what should be not in it, but I think that we're going to have to

look at it since the clock is running down as a separate entity rather than how did we arrive here?

In other words, we can say that the procedure -- you can argue that the procedure -- Mark's assured us that within the comments that you distributed that the funds, the employees and so on, are paid for ultimately by Cape Light Compact and so on.

So if there's an issue with -- if there's an issue in this budget with money, in other words in a sense that there should be some allocation there, that's legitimate.

But at this point, I have to agree with Mark. It doesn't make any sense to go over past history and decide how we got here because we're here, you know.

The other thing is is that once we convene, we're going to be discussing this among ourselves. So I recommend to the Delegates if you have any amendments, you have any discussion within the budget process that I anticipate we're going to be having, you should -- and you could probably be worthwhile to run it by him now rather than drag him back later on.

So if there's anything going -- does anybody got --

Mr. CAKOUNES: Nope.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No? No surprises. Okay. Well, you better hang around, Mark.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: The horse is dead.

Mr. CAKOUNES: No horses' heads.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, in that case, we will go to the next item on the Agenda. Communications from Other Public Officials? Hearing none.

Communications from Members of the Public

Speaker BERGSTROM: Communications from Members of the Public? Okay. We'll start over there. Ms. Green.

Ms. LILLIAN ANN GREEN: Thank you. Is this on? Lillian Ann Green, Wellfleet. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I will be brief.

I would like to congratulate you as a body for questioning the County budget. My deceased husband and I have long had a number of questions about the real costs which are hidden costs of the staff of CLC and CVEC. And that is why I continue to come to these meetings.

I appreciate any effort you make in providing transparency regarding this topic. Especially since these entities claim on one hand that they are quasi-government entities and not answerable to the public or even the Assembly of Delegates.

The people of Barnstable County should know what CLC and CVEC are costing us. Actually, after we know what these costs are, shouldn't we question why Barnstable County is even paying the full costs. Aren't both Barnstable and Dukes County involved with these, what they say, on one hand a quasi-government entity, shouldn't Dukes pay their fair share if, indeed, the County taxpayers should pay these costs at all.

And I am a Wellfleet citizen, as I said. I am a ratepayer and a taxpayer. So I also have the question of why Wellfleet taxpayers and the town of Wellfleet should pay anything for CVEC since Wellfleet is not a member CVEC.

And one last point, one nagging question, something that I've asked and this is why I have been involved is because we had questions. We've gone. We've tried to get answers, and we have not gotten answers and we've come before you.

If something does go wrong, if there's a shortfall especially with CVEC and their multimillion dollar ventures do these entities all of a sudden become County government entities so the taxpayers shall do the mistakes?

And what are the measures taken so this will never happen? These measures should be transparent and open for scrutiny. And I hope that you'll continue to delve into the finances of CLC and CVEC. You have the support of many in the public.

And I did want to also bring to your attention that on the May 14 the Department of Public Utilities hearing regarding DPU 1469, the Cape Light Compact's Proposed Aggregation Plan, I attended that hearing. The CLC treasurer stated to DPU the following. "CLC is a public organization. CLC is competitive and puts customers first. CLC is transparent," and he also spoke of the audit that was held.

And I've been here in these meetings, and the auditors actually said it was a review and not an audit. And he was not the only person who made these kinds of statements.

So the treasurer of the entity that refused to provide you, our Legislative branch of County government, with simple documents you requested is making these statements. And there is a transcript. I urge you to look at that transcript.

I did submit the report of the Assembly of Delegates Special Committee, Resolution 15-06, and a letter from the Speaker of the Assembly for the record to DPU. And I received a guarantee from the Hearing Officer that these supporting documents will be posted on line at DPU along with the transcript of the hearing.

Thank you for your time.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes, Mr. Bibler.

Mr. ERIC BIBLER: For the record, I'm Eric Bibler. Well, first, I just want to say that I know this is painful work that you're doing. I think its necessary work. And I think you're all to be applauded for taking it on. I know that it's not very appetizing to do it, you know, with a looming deadline also.

But I really do applaud you for taking the responsible position of insisting that you want to know what you're approving before you approve it. And I think that cuts across all sorts of lines. I know there's one Delegate here who went to the County Commissioners and said she had no problem with Cape Light Compact but she couldn't approve this budget until she understood it.

In terms of my credentials, I just want to tell you a couple things. I'm not, as some have said, a tool of the oil and gas industry. And, just parenthetically, I don't think there's been a wind turbine project from CVEC proposed for three years.

In my misspent youth, I was a tool of the financial industry perhaps, and I worked for Money Center Bank and I ran a couple of bond trading desks, and a lot of my customers were pension funds, and it was my job to understand them and understand their issues. So I feel like I do have some understanding of these issues.

I just want to briefly touch on a few things that -- oh, I should also -- I wanted to say also I'm the Chief Procurement Officer of my local EMS. I'm the head of the investment committee, and I'm the head of the finance committee, and we have a \$3 million endowment. So I'm very involved with all those issues. I had my own NASD firm and I was the Chief Compliance Officer. So I think I'm familiar with a lot of these types of regulatory aspects.

Just a couple things that came out that to me are highly important and should be highly important to you that I just want to fly for you. I know you're not going to resolve them today, and I'm going to just -- there are only three of them.

The first thing is, and I think you've already touched on it, and I tried to outline some of this in an email. I think the most important thing for you to do first off is to just get accurate cost allocations, cost attributions for these services that the County is providing.

You know, you really need to identify these subsidies essentially that you're providing the services for free and then you can decide what to do about it. You can continue to get them away for free or you can charge for them. But, you know, first you have to quantify them. And I don't see that that's been done anywhere.

I think that is a transparency issue, not a communication issue. I don't think those costs have ever been calculated. And there are a number of them, so I would urge you not to forget any of them.

Second thing, real quickly, OPEB. You know, I've tried really hard to understand this. I reviewed the meeting of the County Commissioners from January 8, backwards and forwards a number of times so that I could actually write it down and make a little transcript. And what I heard in that meeting, and I'm looking for the numbers, but I heard the County treasurer say that the size of the liability was approximately 50-\$60 million, that he believed that to fully retire the OPEB obligation of the County would require payments of 4-1/2 to \$5 million over a 20 year period, every year for 20 years, and that these numbers were based on a discount rate of 7-and-7/8ths percent, an investment rate of 7-and-7/8ths percent, 50-60 million, 4-1/2 -- 5 million a year, 7-and-7/8ths.

If that's true, that's terrible news. That means that the true liability is much bigger.

Now I attended the County Commissioners' meeting today and the auditor was there. And he said that the size of your OPEB liability is \$31 million and that was predicated on the actuarial assumptions that are used for your employees. I caught him on the way out the door. He said this is over a 30 year period of payments and that they were using a much more reasonable and realistic 4-1/2 percent rate.

Well, if that's true, that's fantastic news. That means that your liability is maybe a third to a half as what I would have thought it would have been in January. But the bad news is those two counts don't square. I urge you to reconcile them and just get to the bottom of it because I've attended one and monitored another County Commissioners' meeting and gotten two completely different, wildly different numbers for your liability.

Today, I went to the Cape Light Compact meeting. They're proposing to do, I think, a very responsible thing. They are saying they want to fund their portion of the OPEB reserve that they've accumulated. That's a great thing; right? Take their funds and fund it.

And in their budget, that number is \$300,000 to fully fund it. Now if they do that, that would theoretically take the County off the hook for that obligation for their employees. The only problem is that this is the operating -- I don't know what this means because this is the operating budget.

And in this budget, they have salaries for two employees; right. So this may be the funding for two employees, and they were very swift to say that the majority of their employees are all paid out of the Energy Efficiency Funds over here and there might be 15 of those; okay.

So I mean I don't know whether this OPEB obligation that they're creating for you is 10 times this number, you know, over an energy-efficiency or whether this is the whole enchilada. I think you should find out.

I'm trying to remember; there was one other thing I wanted to say. Oh yes. So the Administrative Services Agreement has been brought up. It's open-ended, and essentially you're providing all these services for free but you don't know what they are, so I urge you to

find out.

As far as these County employees go, you know, it's not so much whether or not you're meeting the current expenses and its passing through all these other agencies. What really matters is, you know, because you're probably keeping up with that. But if you have these County employees and they're creating this liability for you out over the horizon, which is what's happening all over America in every municipality and every state government and the federal government, the real question for you is where does the buck stop?

I mean if they're County employees and you're reimbursing their salaries and push comes to shove and there's some event 20 years from now that somebody has to pay that OPEB, who owns it? I mean I think you do. I think if they're receiving County benefits and they're receiving County promises that out over that horizon that belongs to you. And I think you would be well advised if it belongs to you to find out what it is.

The final thing is and this is just a commonsense suggestion. We all know you have a deadline. You've got to get something done. You've got to meet payroll in a few weeks here and you've got to have some kind of budget.

There's been all this talk about basically kicking the can down the road and having another look at this for the 2016 budget. And I would just urge you -- on you a very commonsense suggestion to get to the bottom of all these things but take the 2014 budget and get the actual cost allocations for '14 and '15 even if you just vote this through the way it is and have a baseline. Get yourself a set of facts to work from so that when you're back here a year from now or nine months from now you have actual numbers for what happened in the past that you can use to project what your budget ought to be for the future year. Okay.

So I mean I really just want to offer those suggestions. I drove here today to offer them. I felt like I had some knowledge of this stuff. And I think you may have good news and that your liability is a fraction.

I want to give the Clerk a copy of the Cape Light Compact budget so you can see its OPEB and put it in your record.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So we might have access to that without your help.

Mr. ERIC BIBLER: Well, it might cost you \$50. I thought I'd save you the money.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I'll take it. That will be 10 bucks, please.

Okay. Thank you. Do we have any other Members of the Public who wish to address us?

Ms. KATHY SHERMAN: Kathy Sherman, Brewster. In preparation for the hearing last week, I did look very carefully at a lot of record.

And one thing that I think we need to understand is how much the energy-efficiency portion of the Compact's budget has increased. And the County that it resulted from the Green Communities Act, the County actually got towards 800-and-maybe \$50,000 grant, block grant from stimulus money to sort of ease the transition of escalating requirements to fulfill that.

But now ratepayers are paying quite a bit of money for that. The way it was set up for the utilities, they're supposed to get other sources of funds. The Compact did temporarily. But that transition year I think is one reason why it's important to have the grants on the books.

And, you know, I appreciate that the County did that. But whether you -- when you come up with procedures, I hope you'll include that kind of thing. Usually even if it's only in kind matching for a grant or whatever, that stuff is on the books.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else wish to address the

Assembly?

Assembly Convenes

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. In that case, we will now convene, and we will begin with Assembly reconsideration of Proposed Ordinance 14-01.

After our last meeting, Janice and I went into panic mode, and we went back into the Charter and the Manual of Governance. We found out that any Delegate can, according to the language of the Charter, can file for reconsideration before noon of the next day.

Now, normally under Robert's Rules, it has to be somebody on the losing side but the Manual of Governance doesn't say that.

So, of course, we did the obvious thing; we went to the lawyers, and we filed away a request from Mr. Troy. And he came back to us and he said, "You have to go specifically with the language of the Manual of Governance. If it doesn't refer to which side, then that's where we are."

So we feel -- oh, the second thing you've got to understand is the decision on that is up to me. So I have decided that I'm going to go with the Manual of Governance. Okay.

And also that you should know is that in looking at the Charter and Janice and I have also discussed this, and also we've heard from the Commissioners and Mark, the language in the Charter is very specific. It's we have to pass -- if we don't pass a budget by June 1, the Commissioners' budget becomes the budget.

Now we haven't amended or done anything, so we have an opportunity now to pass a budget. It doesn't have to be what they want but we do have an obligation.

If you do not wish to have the Commissioners' budget automatically go into effect, we're under some pressure to pass a budget. Okay.

So that's just to frame the argument here to everybody's understanding. So, I'm going to go to John.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Can I ask a question first? Before he makes a motion, Mr. Speaker, could I just ask a point of order again to clarify it?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sure.

Mr. CAKOUNES: You're saying that the motion to reconsider is only going to require a majority vote; is that correct?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Thank you.

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker, as petitioner who filed a request for reconsideration of Proposed Ordinance 14-01, I now make the motion for the reconsideration of Proposed Ordinance 14-01.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. So, what we're going to discuss now is whether or not we want or do not want reconsideration. The practical effect of this if we don't reconsider, the Commissioners' budget goes into effect.

So does everybody understand that? Okay. We'll take a vote on this. Do we need a voice vote or do we need a roll call?

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: Is there going to be discussion?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sure. Go ahead, John.

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I just think in fairness to the people of Barnstable County that we need to discuss this budget and either propose it as presented by the Commissioners or change it, but we need to do that and not let this lie fallow.

So I urge my fellow Delegates to vote the reconsideration in a favorable manner.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Anybody else? Hearing none.

Voting YES (85.78%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (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 (10.22%): Leo Cakounes (5.67% - Harwich), Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster).

Absent (4.00%): Ned Hitchcock (1.27% - Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, the Motion to Reconsider Proposed Ordinance 14-01 was approved with 85.78 percent of the Delegates voting yes; 10.22 percent voting no; 4 percent absent.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you. So here we are. Déjà vu all over again. And we now have Proposed Ordinance 14-01, which is the County budget, which you should have already gone over in front of us.

So, anybody wish to -- yes, Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I make a motion.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Somebody needs to make a motion to approve it.

Ms. KING: Make a motion to --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Oh, okay. Yes, we have to put it on the --

Ms. KING: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I don't know. Do we have to have (Inaudible) for reconsideration?

Ms. KING: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, doesn't that put it on the table?

Mr. CAKOUNES: No. Somebody needs to make a motion to approve it or deny it and get it on the table.

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Speaker --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. OHMAN: In aid of redundancy, I would like to propose the passage of Proposed Ordinance 14-01 as presented to us by the Commissioners.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It's been moved and seconded. It's on the table now for consideration.

Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I have a Motion to Amend.

Speaker BERGSTROM: A Motion to Amend.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I have it written out, and I'd like to pass it out. I'm sorry I didn't type it up but I kind of ran out of time.

What I want to do is make my motion, and then if there's a second, I'd like to speak to it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: So the motion is we amend the budget to delete the proposed tax increase in the County tax assessment, which would result in a reduction in revenue of \$74,314.

And that we compensate for that to balance the budget by reducing the increase in Information Technology, which is Department 105, by \$35,000.

And that we reduce the County Cape Cod Commission Joint Initiatives increase by 39,314, which would result in there being a balanced budget and the elimination of the tax increase.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. It's been moved and seconded.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I just want to speak briefly to this. I made this motion last week in an air of protest because I have my .9 percent. And I have to say I was surprised and gratified that the motion passed.

However, I understood why reconsideration was filed here. You know I understand we're at a jam for time.

However, I think there are a couple of things here that are important. One of them is that we know that there are areas of this budget that we do not understand in terms of transparency of Barnstable County income revenues, expenses, and accounts.

The second thing is that I don't believe that a tax increase can be justified by the fact that because we can do it, we will do it, and, therefore, we have a right to 2-1/2 percent.

I don't support that. I don't think that this body ought to support it. And I certainly think that it's probably the only thing that is totally clear to me under this budget is that we have not seen a justification to increase taxes either by 2-1/2 percent or 1 percent or \$15.

And, therefore, I urge you to adopt this amendment. I think it sends a message about the budget, and I will say that I don't think that it hurts the operation of the County.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Anybody else have to comment on this? I'd just like to say I understand where Deborah's coming from. The only thing is is I was around when Mark discussed -- mentioned the fact that we had surpluses.

And for a period of time it may have been as many as 10 years, we didn't take the 2-1/2 percent increase. And what happens is is that like interest rates that accumulates.

So even though it seems like it's only \$70,000, that's a reliable source of revenue. In other words, it can be counted on each year. So when you're looking at the budget you know that the amount -- the assessment of the County, you know what that is and you know what the increase is.

The revenue from the Registry of Deeds is not reliable. In other words, we don't know what that is.

So I would, you know, you could say, "Well, we don't have to do it." I'm an advocate of putting money into reserves because the unreliable income from the Registry of Deeds goes up and down, and we found ourselves going from a half a million dollar surplus to where we had within I think 3 or 4 years ago we had to start cutting. We cut employees and we even took a salary decrease; it's hard to believe, but we went from 1,000 to 500.

So I mean its 70,000 one way or another. I understand it can be a symbolic gesture. I'm not really strongly opposed or in favor of this, but I think we should -- there are financial considerations to making sure the County has reliable source of revenue in the future.

Anyone want to comment on this? Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I think I understand that Deborah was not linking her unhappiness from before about transparency with this issue. This isn't meant to send a message about still lingering thoughts about transparency. This was meant to be a fiscally conservative position against tax increase. I think I'm correct in that's what she meant.

But I agree with you, Ron, that like the towns, they're not a lot of towns and there are not a lot of government organizations that are not taking the kind of increase such as 2.5 percent, which is barely keeping up with changes in what costs rise by.

So, I think it's a mistake to go back to that, which was okay when we did it. But now we're not in those kinds of situations.

And I don't know -- I have certainly also want to have a lot more explanation about why those two reductions will not have any negative effect on County operations. I think they could and I want to know why they wouldn't.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I'd like to respond to that if I could?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sure.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I think you can see from the motion, Julia, that the Information Technology is scheduled to have an increase of \$531,000. This proposes to reduce their increase by 35,000.

And the County -- Cape Cod Commission Joint Initiatives is scheduled to have an increase of \$607,000. That's an increase, not a basic budget, and this would reduce them 39,314.

I am not just advocating fiscal conservatism here. I'm also saying that I think last meeting we sent a message about wanting to have our questions answered without having to resort to lawyers and subpoenas and courts, which was what we heard from our counsel.

I think there's both a message here and with respect the transparency, and there's also an issue here about tax increases. I don't think 2-1/2 percent is an entitlement. I just don't.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Do we have someone from the other side?

Mr. CAKOUNES: John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak against this amendment and specifically about the OPEB, the Other Post-Employment Benefits problem.

The most optimistic view I've heard so far in the last several months, including today, is that we're now \$30 million of our contractual obligations to our retirees.

If this \$70,000 could be allocated for that, that's fine. It becomes part of a bigger pool that we can use part of it or most of it or all of it to continue those obligations I think is very important.

The articulate speaker from Wellfleet, Connecticut even, brought this up as a very important thing for us to discuss, and I think he happens to be right on this matter. And I think that we should not pass this amendment as proposed. We can't afford it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes. I'm going to speak in favor of the amendment. At the presentation with the auditors prior to this meeting, they talked about undesignated fund balances which are monies that are left over after you've spent what you've budgeted.

And two years ago, there was 1.78 million, and then I believe last year was coming up to

1.6 million. And a lot of this money goes into reserve accounts. And I think that's admirable, and I think that's a very fiscally responsible thing to do.

But I also think that just increasing 2-1/2 percent when you already currently have healthy fund -- undesignated fund balances is probably not the time to be going up 2-1/2 percent.

Perhaps in a year or two, if there's a shortage or we're looking specifically or we have an actual plan or policy about how we're going to fund OPEB, then certainly, come back to me with your 2-1/2 percent or whatever it is that you want to do.

But right now just to kind of throw more money at more money doesn't work for me.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. I'd just like to point out -- oh, Cheryl, do you want to say something?

Ms. ANDREWS: Yes, just a question. I understand there are two decreases that you're suggesting, speaking to the Delegate from Truro. One clearly is it looks like it's a Cape Cod Commission cost. Is the other as well, the Department 105? Is that also a Cape Cod Commission cost?

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: No, that's Information Technology.

Ms. ANDREWS: Okay. So that comes out of the County-side of the budget?

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Right. So does the joint initiative.

Ms. TAYLOR: So does the other.

Ms. ANDREWS: Because you're decreasing -- I mean that's just the confusion here is we're decreasing the tax assessment but that's really income that is specifically targeted for the Cape Cod Commission.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No. No. No.

Ms. ANDREWS: Why not?

Mr. CAKOUNES: The County share.

Ms. KING: No.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: The County share of the joint initiative.

Ms. TAYLOR: They have their own tax.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: The County --

Ms. ANDREWS: All right. If one person could answer me, I'd be thrilled. But the last time I got my frame around County government, the environmental tax; isn't that what you're talking about here? The 2.5?

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: No. No.

Speaker BERGSTROM: This is a separate appropriation that the County made for this initiative with the Cape Cod Commission; am I right on that?

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No. No.

Ms. KING: Ron, you don't know what you're talking about.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: No. The County tax assessment is a tax that all of the cities and towns pay --

Ms. ANDREWS: Right, and that's --

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: (Inaudible) County government.

Ms. ANDREWS: No, not a cherry sheet. And the cherry sheet charge -- what have we got on cherry -- well, okay. You guys are waiving your heads; teach me.

How many charges from County do we have on the cherry sheet for each town; do we have one or two?

Mr. CAKOUNES: Can I answer that, Mr. Speaker?

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: Two.

Ms. ANDREWS: Oh, so there's two. Okay. So the environmental tax submission and then we have a separate one?

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Yes.

Ms. ANDREWS: Thank you. I had a little -- I'm not even a senior yet. Okay. Thank you, very much. So this doesn't affect the Commission -- the Cape Cod Commission's income.

Ms. KING: That's correct.

Ms. ANDREWS: All right. Go it. Sorry for the confusion.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I'd just like to point out that most of the towns have already had Town Meeting. The increase in assessment would be included in the budget that they submitted.

Ms. ANDREWS: But we (Inaudible).

Speaker BERGSTROM: I mean we could send them a nice letter and say, "Guess what." You know, you --

Ms. ANDREWS: I don't think we've gotten our cherry sheets from the state yet though.

Mr. OHMAN: They don't (Inaudible).

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, I mean I think they -- the appropriation for the County has probably been considered in the budget (Inaudible).

So if there's no further discussion, I guess we will take a vote on the amendment as proposed by Delegate McCutcheon.

Clerk O'CONNELL: This is on the amendment. We're not voting on the amended budget yet, just on the amendment.

Voting YES (69.67%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Leo Cakounes (5.67% - Harwich), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster).

Voting NO (26.33%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Absent (4.00%): Ned Hitchcock (1.27% - Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, the amendment to Proposed Ordinance 14-01 was approved with 69.67% voting yes; 26.33 % voting no; 4.00 % absent.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Now we have the main motion, which is the proposed County budget for FY15 Proposed Ordinance 14-01 as amended to \$28,397,442 on the floor. Is there any other discussion on the proposed budget? We all look very complacent. Okay.

Well, I have a motion on the floor then, and the motion is to approve the proposed Fiscal 15 County budget as amended. So we will now take a vote.

Voting YES (90.33%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe

**(11.02% - Yarmouth), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), John Ohman (6.58
Dennis), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Anthony Scalse (4.55% - Brewster), Julia
Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).**

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

**Absent (4.00%): Ned Hitchcock (1.27% - Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga
(2.73% - Orleans).**

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, Proposed Ordinance 14-01 as amended passes with 90.33 percent of the Delegates voting yes; 5.67 percent voting no; 4 percent absent.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So where we are now is that we have now passed a budget that differs from the budget presented by the County Commissioners. This will go to them for their approval or disapproval.

Should they disapprove, then a number of things come into place, all of which we don't have time for. We're going to have to make the time for it. In other words, if there's a reconciliation process, we're going to have to move rather quickly because we have until July 1.

Clerk O'CONNELL: June 1.

Speaker BERGSTROM: June 1.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Which is impossible.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No, no, no.

Clerk O'CONNELL: We've got to pass the budget by June 1.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We've passed the budget.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Well, we just passed the amended budget. Now it goes to the Commissioners.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Commissioners, yes, right.

Clerk O'CONNELL: And they have to act on it. They'll either approve it or send it back.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Right.

Clerk O'CONNELL: If they send it back, we don't have enough time for a reconciliation process.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: Well you can override it.

Clerk O'CONNELL: They've got to pass it by June 1.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: You could override it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We could override it, yes. Well, anyway, we'll figure that out the time regardless of any of this. See, I think --

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: I veto Leo's "No."

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, we don't meet. See, this is a quick -- is the Manual of Governance here? I'm going to say -- they said we have to pass a budget by June 1. We passed a budget. The reconciliation process can go into June. No? What do you think, Julia?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Well, I've got an Ordinance 07-13 that lays out the timeframe and the time frame is not possible.

Mr. MARK ZIELINSKI: No, believe me, Janice and I we were talking about all of this.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We'll find out --

Ms. TAYLOR: I don't think the Commissioners are going to veto it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No. I think they'll find creative ways of -- they'll follow a supplemental -- sneak a supplemental -- sneak a supplemental somewhere in next March.

Anyway, since we're totally at sea here, we're going to keep going. So the next thing is a report from the Clerk.

Report from the Clerk

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

Ms. KING: Yay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Nothing to report.

Other Business

Speaker BERGSTROM: Do we have any other business to be brought before the Assembly? We have no other business. So.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: Motion to Adjourn.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All those in favor of adjourning, say "Aye."

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