

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT
ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES**

APPROVED Journal of Proceedings - June 4, 2014

Speaker BERGSTROM: Good afternoon. Welcome to the June 4th session of the Cape Cod Regional Government, Assembly of Delegates.

Anyone recording this meeting besides us? No. Okay. So we will begin with a moment -- 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 (61.74%): 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), 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), Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster).
Absent (38.26%): Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).**

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, we have a quorum present with 61.74 percent of the Delegates present; 38.26 percent absent.

Committee of the Whole

Speaker BERGSTROM: Thank you.

We now need approval to the Calendar of Business.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: So moved.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Moved and seconded. No additions or corrections to the Calendar. All those in favor of accepting the Calendar say "Aye." Opposed?

(Motion carried.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: Hopefully you got a copy of the Journal of May 21st, 2014. Okay. Was that the last meeting?

Clerk O'CONNELL: No, the 30th was but that's not ready yet. I didn't get it on time to place it on the agenda. Next meeting.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So we're talking about the last regularly scheduled meeting in May. Any additions or corrections to that Journal?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Move to approve.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. All those in favor say "Aye." Opposed?

Okay.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: And one abstention.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And one abstention from Wellfleet.

(Motion carried.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: We now have -- normally we would have Communications from and discussion with the Board of Regional Commissioners. The Commissioners didn't meet today so they are not with us.

Communications from Public Officials

Speaker BERGSTROM: Do we have any Communications from Public Officials?

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I'm a public official; aren't I?

Speaker BERGSTROM: You are.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I am addressing this in my capacity as an elected public official, as a representative to the County.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Go ahead.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Well, it's not funny. I'm an elected representative to County government and, as such, am bound to represent my constituents to the best of my ability with honesty and integrity.

Each of us has a protective right of free speech. And in the context of representative government as a Delegate to the Assembly, I'm duty-bound to speak out on issues we are called upon to decide.

I was shocked to hear an elected official, County Commissioner William Doherty, suggest at a County Commissioners' meeting on May 28, 2014, at about 12 minutes into the meeting that the County retaliate against the town of Truro because of actions I, as the Truro Delegate, have taken in the deliberations in this Assembly.

All too often our political system within Massachusetts and nationally is manipulated unfairly by corrupt politicians. I spoke out against a tax increase. If I believe a recommended tax increase is unwarranted, it's my duty to oppose it.

Mr. Doherty's retaliatory threats coerce all of us to silence and betrays obligations as an elected representative of all of the citizens of Barnstable County.

The other two County Commissioners did not object to Doherty's threat. Whether their silence was because they acquiesced in his coercive conduct or because they've been brought to heel by this corrupt thug, the result is the same. Bullying was ignored and thereby encouraged.

I'm speaking out about this today because I object. I will not be bullied into silence.

Thank you for your time.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Well, I don't want to talk too much about this because it's not on the agenda, so it's kind of -- but I'm sure that we'll hear more about it as time goes on.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Communications from Members of the Public? Hearing none.

Assembly Convenes

Speaker BERGSTROM: We'll now go into the Finance -- the Assembly will now convene, and we will begin with the Finance Committee Minutes dated 5/21/14.

Do we have a quorum of the Finance Committee? Yes, we do; right?

Clerk O'CONNELL: John, Leo, and Jim.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Okay. So, go ahead, John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On May 21, the Finance Committee met to discuss the financial statements for the County's audit with the County's auditing firm, CliftonLarsonAllen, which has been taken over -- has now taken over from the former Rogers & Sullivan group. It's still the same accountant that is doing the work from us.

We invited Matt Hunt in to discuss and let him have free reign over what the crux of the four financial statements that he gave us are.

The highlights included in the summarized information in the Finance Report that the Assembly of Delegates received, that meeting and the PowerPoint handout that he provided will be available in Janice's office -- the County Clerk's Office for review for anybody that would like to see it.

The first good news he gave us is that the County received an unqualified opinion of its financial statements. Basically this is the best type of opinion you can receive. They were free from any material errors or misstatements and that was a compliment to the financial folks on the County side.

As far as the General Fund goes, he said the General Fund had a balance of \$6 million. I know that the Assembly has been very concerned about how much money we really do have. And there's a breakdown I can go over, but, essentially, there's two statutory reserves; one of \$297,000 and the restricted reserve of 381,000 for the life insurance feature liability. That represents \$675,000 of restricted fund balance.

The next step would be their committed continuing effort appropriations for 1.8 million, most of that goes to the new refurbished jail. Committed employee benefits for 121,000 and assigned encumbrance of 891,000. That's about \$2.8 million. That is, once again, that is encumbered. We can't touch that.

But the last item is an unassigned fund balance of \$2.6 million which is up by \$1.4 million, and by this estimate it was because mostly because the Registry of Deeds money was higher than anticipated. So we're in pretty good financial shape there as well. Yeah.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. John, you're going to need a minute -- do we need to approve those minutes?

Mr. OHMAN: Yes. Do you want to approve them first?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, you can approve them anytime you want but it has to -- now is as good of time as any.

Mr. OHMAN: First of all, let's do that. Sorry about that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Just hold on; I've got a question or you here.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Am I right that the Unassigned Fund balance can be spent on anything?

Mr. OHMAN: According to the accounting agency, yes, they can be spent on anything. They have designations but they can -- they're unencumbered. They could be spent on anything.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: So they could certainly come to us and ask to use that for the \$70,000 tax increase we didn't give them; is that right?

Mr. OHMAN: Ms. McCutcheon, that's absolutely true.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: Just a quick question. How many copies of those statements did we get? I'm just wondering if I can get a copy?

Mr. OHMAN: I believe that they were given to the members of the Finance Committee and Janice has one in her office.

Ms. ANDREWS: Okay. So do we --

Speaker BERGSTROM: We can get you a copy of it if you want.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Are you talking about the audited financial statements?

Ms. ANDREWS: The reports from CLA.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Everybody received one and I put it in your folder the first week in May.

Ms. ANDREWS: Okay. So the documents he has I already have in my mailbox?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes. I sent them in the Assembly packet.

Ms. ANDREWS: Okay. All right.

Clerk O'CONNELL: The actual meeting minutes and --

Ms. ANDREWS: No, I don't want the meeting minutes. I'm asking about the documents.

Clerk O'CONNELL: You want -- which documents is he referring to?

Ms. ANDREWS: The ones -- the binded ones that he's holding up.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Oh yes, everybody got those.

Ms. ANDREWS: We got those. Okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Mr. OHMAN: Anyway, I'd like to interrupt this informative session by asking my committee-as-present to approve the Minutes that I'm reading right now.

Mr. CAKOUNES: So moved.

Mr. KILLION: Second.

Mr. OHMAN: Second. All those in favor?

Mr. CAKOUNES: Aye.

Mr. KILLION: Aye.

(Minutes approved.)

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you. Continuing on. The other major governmental funds are the Septic Loan Fund has a fund balance of \$24.4 million which may sound like a lot. It's got 15 million in non-spendable loans and the restricted funds of 9.4 million.

The Dredge Enterprise Fund, which I think is an interesting fund that they targeted this time, has a net asset of \$1.6 million of which 1.2 million was unrestricted. Now that 1.2 million is meant to replace the dredge hopefully in the very near future.

The next point was "Long-term Debt Outstanding." We have a corresponding number of outstanding debt service with the Septic Loan Fund of \$24.5 million, which basically makes that a wash. It's all committed funds.

There's -- he got into OPEB, which I know is a touch point of mine and several other people on the Assembly; Other Postemployment Benefits. He stated that there was a \$9.5 million net OPEB liability at the end of fiscal year 2013. It increased by \$1.4 million. And you can assume that that's going to go up by at least \$1.4 million for the foreseeable future each and every year.

His total valuation which was a matter of discussion at the last Assembly meeting; we have an accrued liability today of \$31 million for the OPEB. At this moment, he said that it has no impact -- negative impact on bond rating. But when pressed on the issue, he

said that it doesn't have it yet. And yet in fiscal year 2015, they're going to change the way that all municipalities must record their OPEB liabilities by making them state by number how much that it is. And it's going to possibly change the equation with the bonding agency.

So I wanted everybody on the Assembly to know that, that as we go forward, the bonding agency may look at this differently. There will be a hard number to look at for every municipality including Barnstable County.

Another thing, because we get a lot of money from federal grants --

Ms. ANDREWS: Can I ask a question?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Hold on, John. You've got a question from Cheryl.

Mr. OHMAN: Yes. Sure.

Ms. ANDREWS: Have you, with regards to OPEB; are you familiar with a phrase ARC? Did that phrase come up at all during your discussions?

Okay. That's something else I've got to research.

Mr. OHMAN: Would you care to elaborate?

Ms. ANDREWS: No, because I don't really understand it. It was someone that spoke to me about OPEB and the County and the phrase "ARC" was used. It sounded like some kind of minimum contribution that we needed to make. And I'm not familiar with it and was hoping somebody else might be. But, all right, more research to do. Thanks.

Mr. OHMAN: Anyway, moving along, one of the last things on our -- we gave him some pretty hard questions on this too. And the reference that I was making to the 2015 fiscal year liability statements is called "GASB Statement 68." And it's going to possibly change the entire equation for every municipality including Barnstable County. And that's something we really have to think about when we decide how we're going to attack the budget or formulate a budget going forward because if we don't put any money into it, it could, starting next year, could dramatically change the equation of the bonding agencies.

The federal government awards that they -- they targeted three of them for the expenditures were \$2.2 million in FY '13. This is a full year ago. The Home Investing Partnerships Program, the Highway Planning & Construction and AmeriCorps, they went through these with a fine-toothed comb and found that there were no -- they were all in compliance with no problems at all. So I thought that was to the County's benefit as well.

The management letters declared that there were no significant deficiencies in material or material missing in their financial controls, which is also very good news.

I'm open to any questions.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Does anybody have any questions for John?

Mr. CAKOUNES: I have a comment.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sure. Go ahead, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I noticed as I was reading the minutes of last week's meeting that I stated that we had a \$1.4 million Unassigned Fund Balance. I was going to correct the Minutes, but I couldn't correct it because that's what I actually said.

So I want to draw your attention to the fact that we have a \$2.6 million Unassigned Fund Balance. It's \$1.4 million over the previous year.

And when I answered that question last week, I must have got those two figures confused. So, just for the record and for those people who don't have the Minutes in front of them, if you intend on looking through the financial statements, I would suggest that you print out a copy of the Minutes; they're only two pages long. And you can use what we

discussed at the meeting pending going through the books to kind of combine the two together.

Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Can I get in here a minute?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Janice has something to add to that.

Clerk O'CONNELL: It's wonderful when you can get access right here to answer your question.

Ms. ANDREWS: Oh.

Clerk O'CONNELL: "ARC" --

Speaker BERGSTROM: GASB.

Clerk O'CONNELL: "ARC" as referenced in GASB 45. Those were the rules that changed everything with regards to the OPEB. And it refers to -- it's an abbreviation for an "Annual Required Contribution. It's the level of employer contribution required on a sustained ongoing basis to systematically fund the normal cost of this benefit. It is the amount needed to pay benefits as they come due plus amortized."

So that's basically it without getting any more complicated than that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Just to add to what Janice just said and what Leo just said is that we have uncommitted reserves of \$2.6 million, which is good because we don't have a reliable source of income in the sense that the income from the Registry of Deeds can vary year to year. We're just speculating on how much we're going to get. So it's good to have reserves.

On the other hand, usually what you do is you set an upper limit to the reserves. You say, "Well, we're going to put aside 2 million, you know, and if we have to dip into it next year, we'll build it up again. We'll always try to keep what they call" -- I guess the state calls it a "Rainy Day Fund."

So I think as we -- since we had a lot of discussion on the budget and better ways of doing things, we can think about what to do with the money that's left over at the end of the year. Whether we should establish a reserve to be used to simply to fund the budget if, indeed, the money from the Registry of Deeds doesn't -- declines. On the other hand, I don't think we should just keep squirreling it away.

The alternatives would be let's say we want to establish a \$2 million reserve. So we have \$2 million -- 2.6. What do you do with the 6? We can do one of two things. We can either use it for the OPEB, you know, or we could use it in a Capital Fund, which means we put it aside for capital improvement projects which ultimately come down the road. In a better world, we would know when it's going to come due to repave the parking lot or when it's going to come due to put the new roof on or something like that and we have money set aside for that.

So we'll have to talk to Mark about that but if anybody has any suggestions as to how to budget these monies, you can submit an Ordinance or Resolution and we can discuss it.

Yes, Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes. I just went to my notes of that Finance Committee meeting when the auditors' spoke. And there was a 2.6 million carry-forward from last year. However, it was discussed that there was 820,000 I think that was encumbered so that left a balance of 1.7. That's why I've been using the figure 1.7. It's truly unrestricted at this

point.

So if we're going to go forward, let's make sure that we're all talking about -- make sure we wrap our heads around the numbers so that we're all talking about not 2.6 but what the actual number is. There were a lot of numbers flying around and my notes could be wrong. But I just remember questioning Mark Zielinski about exactly how much was unencumbered and it came to about 1.70.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well that contradicts what John said. What do you think about that, John?

Mr. OHMAN: According to my notes, it says that that \$891,000 is separate from the 2.6 million. It's a signed encumbrance of \$891,000 and plus after that we're taking into account there's a balance of 2.6, which is up \$1.2 million from 2012.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, you know, and just since we have some time here, and I think this is important. I'm glad Cheryl brought up that ARC thing because an alternative to simply saying, "Okay. We have money left over this year. We'll put it towards OPEB" would be to do exactly what Janice said which is basically to anticipate how much money we're going to have to put aside each year to cover existing obligations and also to catch up over the course of 20 years. And I'm sure the state has some requirements 20/40 or something, I don't know, and have that as an annual expense written into the budget.

Leo, do you have something?

Mr. CAKOUNES: Yes, I agree with you a hundred percent. The only thing is that I would caution that we not use this because we have to keep in mind that this is 2013's official financial statement which has been reviewed by our auditors.

If you remember last year -- in July of last year, our first meeting, we had some extra money in 2014 that we -- 2013, I mean, that we allocated. We almost spent \$700,000 in one meeting if I remember correctly.

Speaker BERGSTROM: 750, I believe.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Yes, 750. So that in your mind you've got to remember that really came out of this 2.6 additional money. And we really should wait until we get some news from Mark to what our unrestricted or unsigned fund balance for this year, this coming July is going to be. And, quite frankly, you know, I wouldn't want to see a rush to the well the first week of July asking for those funds. I think we should kind of back off and really think about it and talk about things that the Speaker has brought up and other of us have brought up to consider putting away not only for the OPEB but for other expenditures that we see coming down the pipe.

In this particular budget that we just approved, remember we just approved \$300,000 for IT and that was a commitment for at least three years. So we're looking at at least \$900,000 just right there in the next three years. It might be a good idea to just not go crazy spending this money in July.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Well, thank you, John.

Next is Charter Review Committee Report dated May 7, 2014. That seems to be a way's back. You should have a copy of the report in your packet. Of course this was submitted unofficially but submitted to the full Assembly for its approval and it turns out it didn't get its approval.

But the one thing that did come out of it, and I'm not going to go over the whole thing because we've already done that, is a recommendation that we sit down with the

County Commissioners to discuss going forward the rules under the existing Charter and the relationship between the various branches of government and the responsibilities of both the County Commissioners and the Assembly in dealing with things like the budget and, you know, the reorganization of government and so on and so forth.

So I know that the Commissioners have responded to us. You should have a response in your packet. They're more than willing to do this, and our meetings will be, you know, now that the budget process has been completed, at least for now, we will have some time in the next few meetings over the summer although Julia's not going to be with us for a couple meetings and she was a big part of the committee, but we're hoping to sit down with the Commissioners and go through the budget line by line and make sure that we all have an understanding of what it means and how we're supposed to act under it.

So anybody have any suggestions or comments to that or have I put everybody to sleep? Yes.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I just have a question. And I had noticed this before but it has become a little more significant. In the report of the Charter Review, there's a big tax increase for the County. It never got discussed, and I wanted to know why you were recommending it or were you recommending it.

If you look at Page 18, Section 2.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Page 18, Section 2 there. It says --

Speaker BERGSTROM: It says, "We may adopt."

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Right. But it's an ability to almost double the amount of revenue that's charged on every tax -- every property transaction for tax stamps at the Registry of Deeds.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, I think that that is something that is simply defining the current -- I might be wrong, but we currently have the ability to raise that tax up to the limit that it said in here.

So, we're not -- John, we're not up to the limit yet are we; do you know?

Mr. OHMAN: No. We're definitely not up to that limit again. I think we increased it about four years ago.

Ms. KING: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, I think that section just defines -- it's written in the Charter that we have the right to do that but we don't necessarily have to do it.

Ms. ANDREWS: So this isn't anything new?

Speaker BERGSTROM: No, it's not anything new.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay.

Mr. ANDERSON: They did a few years ago and then it got sent back to us because it couldn't be in even pennies.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON: Remember? It came out to be even and it couldn't be even. It had to be an odd amount for some reason.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Well, I don't like to argue with people because I haven't been here around here that long. But I went and looked up all of these things.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: You know, Section 23 of Chapter 64 and looked at -- I'm familiar with the document tax stamp rates. And from this language, it just appears to me

that you have the right to raise this significant amount.

I just wondered whether, and I guess the answer to my question is that the Charter Review Committee wasn't aware of it and didn't discuss it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I don't remember us discussing it. Suzanne, do you remember bringing that up?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We didn't do any language changes. Whatever came in this report was, we assumed, from the current Charter.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: The only language changes we proposed are the ones that we voted on that got turned down in terms of the governance structure.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Oh.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, so the ability for us to raise the levy up to the limit imposed by the Commonwealth is something that was -- it's in the existing Charter. I haven't delved into it as much as you have is my understanding.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Well, I just, you know, I wondered because substantial parts of this have been changed. I guess that's what you --

Speaker BERGSTROM: We were fighting enough of a headwind that we weren't going to recommend a tax increase above everything else.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Well, thank you. I was confused when I read this.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Marcia then Suzanne.

Ms. KING: I have a little problem. I just kind of went through this. Page 5, you're talking about -- you put a residency requirement of one year to run. For Commissioner, I don't believe we currently have a residency requirement.

And then on page -- and I have a little bit of heartache, we were talking now about, again, the County Executive is elected so we are having a mayor or -- what is it -- I don't know what you want to call it. So now we have a beauty contest, which I have expressed my dissatisfaction with that because I think my first comment was, "Look at Toronto and what they got."

Page 10, "Filling of Vacancy. A temporary successor shall be chosen by the remaining members of the County Council to serve until the next biannual state election, at which time the balance," etcetera, etcetera." You don't say is this from the district that the person is at? Is this for the whole County? And you don't even mention if this person has to be a resident of the County.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Marcia, we already turned these -- maybe I kind of confused everybody in the introduction. These were submitted to the Assembly, and the Assembly rejected it.

Ms. KING: Well, I understand that.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So they're only included in the report because that was the original report.

Ms. KING: Okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: You know you're beating a dead horse here.

Ms. KING: Then I'll stop beating a dead horse.

Mr. CAKOUNES: One was tabled and one was turned down.

Ms. KING: Yes, I know.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, and if you look at page 12 of the Charter, that language is

the same.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I think not to confuse people, the first two -- the majority of this report are the two recommendations that the Charter Review Committee brought to the Assembly, both of which were not passed.

So everything in this report was what was recommended and not passed. The only pages that I think are current and relevant are at the very back of the report, the last page specifically, where it says recommendation for the joint meeting.

And the page before that actually says, "No additional Charter changes are proposed for the next election ballot." So essentially what this says is this is what we did; this is what we recommended. It did not get passed so we're not recommending any changes for the 2014 ballot, but we do recommend sitting down with the County Commissioners and going through the Charter line by line if necessary.

I think from that will come language changes. We all have language changes that we know are necessary. But I think right now until we have an understanding of how we are going to function, it's premature to be putting language changes forward when we're not even really following the Charter to begin with.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Teresa.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: That's actually -- at the risk of sounding like a metaphorical broken record, there's stuff in the Charter we don't follow now. And if we were to sit down and go through it line by line, I don't think it's helpful to look at the goal of changing. Issues with the goal of what does it actually say and how do we actually act and put processes into place that follow what the Charter currently says.

As Suzanne was pointing out at the last meeting all the things that don't happen in the budget process that are documented.

So I think it would be important to sit down with both sides and go through line by line to define what it actually says should be happening, not what has always been done or by default happening.

That would be my request, and I think it would make a huge difference not only in next year's budget cycle but in our general functioning as a government.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Are we going to be voting on your recommendation? The recommendation to schedule a meeting of the Assembly of Delegates and the Board of Commissioners to review each article and section of the Barnstable County Home Rule Charter?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, you are.

Mr. CAKOUNES: We are. Okay. Then before anyone makes a motion to do that, I want to just comment on that particular recommendation alone.

I will not be supporting it. I think that if we -- the entire Assembly of Delegates and the entire Board of County Commissioners sit down to do a Charter review, then what we are actually doing is establishing a Charter Review Committee with -- what are there 13 members here and three of the County Commissioners? And that in itself is in violation of the current Charter.

The whole thing of a Charter Review Committee is to have representation from the Assembly, from the County Commissioners, and from the general public at large to take information from the Assembly, take information from the County Commissioners and sit

down and conduct and have open meetings and public discussions and see what part of the current Charter is good and what part isn't and come forward with recommendations.

I mean I don't even understand how a process of having this entire board and the entire County Commissioners or three County Commissioners and a facilitator would actually work.

So before I could even support that recommendation, I think I would need some more information on exactly what you're suggesting we do.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Teresa.

Deputy Speaker MARTIN: Maybe someone from the committee could give us clarity. Is this asking to go through and to look for changes or is this asking to go through and clarify what currently exists?

Speaker BERGSTROM: It's exactly what you described a minute ago. All it is is to go through, for instance, let's say there's a section in the Charter that says that the Assembly has the power to alter/abolish any department of County government.

Now what does that mean? I mean because we can stand here and we can take a vote and say, "We don't want the IT Department." I mean that's what it means. It also means, for instance, that we have to approve any borrowing.

Now the Commissioners in the past practice at least as far as I know is simply to include the carrying costs, the finance costs of borrowing in the budget and saying, "Well, you guys approved the budget and they approved the carrying costs of the debt; therefore, you approve the borrowing."

Well, in my -- I'm coming from the poor, you know, municipal finance part of it. When you borrow, you pass a separate Ordinance to borrow, saying, "We're going to borrow X number of dollars to do this."

Same thing with the departments, there should be -- this is my opinion now, do you want to create a new department, you should have to come before the Assembly since we have the power, as the Charter says, to alter/abolish.

Now, the past practices have varied from the particular language of the Charter. We're not changing anything. We're not making any recommendations. We're simply sitting down with the Commissioners and making sure that we have a mutual understanding of what the responsibilities are and how we're supposed to operate under the existing Charter. What does it mean?

So, basically, we'll sit down. Do we all agree on what it means or are there different interpretations to what it means? And, you know, I think that that would go a long way toward making it a little easier in the past and maybe this body realizing that we could do all sorts of things that we haven't been doing. You know, could assert ourselves a little more than we have been.

So, you know, we don't have to take a vote on this today because we're not going to meet until July, and half the Assembly is not here, at least voting-wise. But I'm just looking to see what the Assembly thinks if we, you know, we don't have to sit down with 15. I made a recommendation just in casual conversation with the Commissioners who maybe we'll assign four or five. And they go, "Well, no, maybe it's better if we all sat down."

It may be this summer that we have a scheduled meeting, we're obliged to meet, as you know, and we'll have a scheduled meeting where we could simply do it during a regularly rescheduled meeting and we could go over the Charter. You know, Section 1 says this. A lot of it is being pro forma, you know, understanding, but some of the points may --

people may object to or they may feel that there's a difference of opinion.

So, anyway, that's how I -- Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For me, I guess I'm getting a little confused because I think we're really talking about maybe three things all at the same time.

The first is is that on today's agenda you placed a report. I wasn't really clear what we were going to do with this report. Apparently, a bunch of us aren't clear.

And I'm going to make the case that it is critical that we all agree on what we're doing with this report. Only because right now as a Selectmen again, I'm dealing with a report out in Provincetown and I've got somebody up in the administration saying, "The Board of Selectmen adopted it." Me being me, I said, "Prove it. Show me the date" and no one has because I'm pretty sure we never did adopt it and it's becoming a bone of contention.

We need to have a historical record. Somebody's going to come after us and say, "Oh, look, there was a committee report." Personally, I think that any votes that we took having to do with this report should be attached to it. So if somebody comes in that's new and says I'd like to see the Charter Review Committee reports for the last 10 years, they could look at this and know what the Assembly did with it.

Whether or not you want a vote to accept the report or reject the report or whatever you call it, you know, that's up to all of you. Personally, it sounds to me like we're rejecting it. I hope we're also thanking the folks that took the time to serve because you put in an amazing number of hours, and, for me, that's kind of the end of this particular process.

The second issue is what do we do about Charter Committee? What do we do about Charter review in the future? It sounds to me like we're going to need another Charter Review Committee. And that's a second issue and that probably should be dealt with in the fall.

And then the third question is how do we deal with the budget cycle we just went through? And it seems that most everybody here is talking about what happened during the budget cycle in terms of disagreements about how the Charter is interpreted.

From my perspective, Ron, what would be very helpful long before we talk about meeting with the Commissioners would be for us to do just what you just started to talk about. Just the Assembly of Delegates has on the agenda a discussion about the Charter. Don't go over every line of it and kill us. Focus on the sections that you folks, especially the folks on the review committee, feel like either, A., we're not familiar with, or B., there's a lack of understanding about it. You think we'd all be served better by understanding.

Let's at least get the Delegates to understand those sections of the Charter better, then I think we can decide what to do as far as our relationship with the Commissioners. Is our relationship over the budget a Charter problem or is it something else? I'm still not sure, frankly. I really don't know. And I think you folks that understand the Charter better than I do would have an opinion on it and I'd like to hear it.

So I think we're putting too much together. And I'll come to that meeting, Ron, and I think you would be -- you and Suzanne and maybe some others would be great to walk us through those points you're trying to tell us about.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Now maybe Janice can correct me on this, but we did submit recommendations to the Assembly for a change in governance. But I don't -- I think it was brought up at the time by the Assembly that we didn't issue an official report. There were complaints saying, "Well, where's your official report?" I said, "Well, we didn't put it

together yet, but here's what we want to do." And then said, "Oh, you can't do anything --." So you took a vote and you said, "We'll take a vote. We'll turn this down, but we want an official report so here it is."

Ms. ANDREWS: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So it's not -- it's no longer recommendations. It's basically a report of what we recommended at the time and the process and what was going on.

The problem I have with your -- the only problem I have with your suggestion, Cheryl, is that the Commissioners pretty much run the County. And, you know, we can decide what our authority is, but we have to make sure that they understand that too because they could simply go ahead and do things with the feeling that they had the right to do that without our approval and we're not going to know about it until somebody complains.

I hear what you're saying and from my perspective what happened this year that's -- unless it has never happened since the Charter was changed in '88.

Speaker BERGSTROM: No, we've had --

Ms. ANDREWS: Well, this big Charter that created the Assembly.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Ms. ANDREWS: What I'm hearing is that this the first year we've had two-thirds of the Assembly override the County Commissioners' budget. There was no reconciliation; it was an override period.

Ms. KING: That's -- you are correct.

Ms. ANDREWS: And that says to me that something very different happened in terms of the way many people on the Assembly who are very vigorous County supporters felt about this budget cycle.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Right.

Ms. ANDREWS: And if the issue is how the Charter is being used, I'd like to support you, meaning I think all 15 of us should hear from you and Suzanne or anybody else that feels that -- and Mr. Curran apparently.

But specifically, you know, things that you think should be done different in terms of what the Assembly is doing. I'd like to hear from you what those things are before you go to the Commissioners. Because I think having the whole Assembly speaking with one voice is what brought us to where we are today.

So the idea of having one or two of you go off to do it again, I'm not so sure it's got a great chance of success.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, I mean, just I don't want to dominate the conversation here, but I don't see any problem with the previous budget process. I mean that's, you know, the fact that we overrode the Commissioners' veto, passed a separate budget doesn't mean that things didn't work. It actually did work. I mean it's the County budget and we have as much authority -- and, theoretically, in some other Legislative bodies, let's take the Massachusetts Legislature, the Governor gives them a budget. They say, "Thank you, very much." They toss it in the wastebasket and then they pass their own budget.

We've been very conciliatory over the last few years. The minor changes we've made are nothing compared to what normally goes on in any kind of bicameral, you know, organization. So, you know, we passed the budget. That's what we're supposed to do.

Ms. ANDREWS: I understand. I thought we also understood though that part of the

reason why we had an override was also that there were problems with the budget process and the transfer of information back between the Assembly and the County Commissioners.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well that may be true but basically what -- there were issues that were brought up during the budget process and have come up during the course of the year as to how much authority the Commissioners have as opposed to the Assembly. Okay.

And I brought up two examples. They should -- it was the opinion of Mr. Curran, who is our advisor that anything they do should have to come before the Assembly. If they wanted to form a new department or a new initiative, it should be separately proposed before the Assembly rather than tucked in the budget and we have to squirrel it out of there with a shoehorn. So that's one issue that's come up.

The other thing is the Capital Improvements Budget or what I call the Capital Budget which is supposed to be submitted each year. And I think anything in the Capital Budget should be designated. In other words, they say, "We want to do this. We want to build another building over there and an outhouse" or something. And say maybe separate - my opinion is they need separate approval to do that, you know, and then it's put into the budget and then it's approved.

So we could decide among ourselves that, yeah, they have to do that. But unless we sit down with them and we look at and we say, "This is what it says; what are you thinking?" We get an agreement; there could be problems in the future.

Yes, Suzanne. Help me out here.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I'm not sure because I've only been on the Assembly for less than two years. I'm not sure that it's a willful not following of the Charter. I almost feel because people have been in place for so long, the administration and some of the County Commissioners, that it's just been more of this is how we've always done things. This is how business is. This is why it goes this way. And now all of a sudden you want us to do things differently so things got a little bit contentious.

I think that there's -- I don't think there's any, you know, willful or malicious not wanting to do things correctly. I think it was just this is the way we've always done it.

My issue is if we're not following a Charter, how do we enforce the Charter? So we can have a discussion, you know, form a committee, have a discussion with the Assembly about the areas where we think the Charter's not being followed. But then that doesn't really get us anywhere if the Commissioners are going to continue to act as they do now.

So I think one of the things we need to do as a body is explore how do we enforce the Charter if, in fact, we do want to do what we're supposed to be doing by law.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Where do we sit now with this document that we're looking at, Mr. Speaker? Are you looking for a motion to accept it? Are you looking to just -- this is the report; you've given it to us --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Oh, it's basically just a report. You don't have to accept it but I don't know. I've never given a report before.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Well my only concern is that when you look at even page 2, just the basic summary, I mean you've got it broken into A, B, C, and D:

And "A" is a summary; obviously that's the summary of the report;

"B" is the recommendation of the existing Charter changes, and that recommendation, structure of government, came before this body did not pass and the other

half was tabled.

“C” is a new recommendation, basically. It states that they’ll be no additional Charter changes proposed in 2014, state ballot. That has not been voted by this Assembly.

And “D” is the more importantly another recommendation which suggests that we have a joint meeting with the Assembly of Delegates and the Board of County Commissioners.

So, once again, I think that maybe we should just discuss “C” and “D” and find out if we are in favor of doing those or if you just want to accept the report then fine. Then, those two recommendations have no faller as far as I’m concerned.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, I think that if we want to accept the report, fine. It’s just a report. You’re not accepting the recommendation of it. I think it’s an excellent suggestion to put in the report, “This was defeated by such-and-such a vote of such-and-such a date.

The reason for the ballot changes is we have missed the deadline. It’s just physically impossible to carry that out and that’s why we just stated that if you want to not vote on that, that’s fine.

And then the recommendation to meet with the County Commissioners was the first step I think to find out what their understanding of the Charter is because they’re not following the Charter.

Thank you. And I should say we aren’t either so.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, all I want to get -- all I really want to get out of this is whether or not we should follow -- obviously, the recommendations of the Charter Review Committee have been turned down by the Assembly.

And I want to do this. If you’re willing to try to reconcile any differences we have with the Commissioners over the Charter interpretation, the recommendation of our committee is that we sit down with them and we go over the -- we don’t have to go over line by line. We could go over any points of contention with the help of a facilitator.

Now if you don’t want to do that, that’s fine. But I see it as an ongoing problem, and it’s something that we should resolve sooner rather than later so that I or anybody who replaces me in this seat knows exactly where we stand when we -- and when things have to be voted on, what do not have to be voted on, you know, what Ordinances and Resolutions are necessary.

Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I want to make a motion, Mr. Speaker, and you can accept it if you think it’s proper or not.

Once again, I just want to remind you that the agenda only states the Charter Review Committee Report dated on May 7 to the Assembly of Delegates. It doesn’t say that we’re going to take a vote.

But with that said, **I would like to move that we accept Recommendation C. “No additional Charter changes proposed on the 2014 state ballot by the Charter Review Committee as so printed in their report May 7, 2014.”**

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Do I have a second?

Mr. OHMAN: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Any further discussion? All those in favor say “Aye.” Opposed? Okay.

(Motion passed.)

Mr. CAKOUNES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a second motion. I would move that we reject Recommendation D, which is, “Joint meeting of the Assembly of Delegates and Board of Commissioners with a facilitator as described in the Charter Review Committee’s report dated May 7, 2014.”

Ms. ANDREWS: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Under discussion, Mr. Speaker?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sure.

Mr. CAKOUNES: The only reason why I strongly object to it is because I don’t really understand its process. And I would like the rest of us to vote to reject it as it is written. And if someone wants to come forward with a more detailed proposal on how this meeting is going to actually happen and what we’re actually going to focus on; the current Charter, the changes in the Charter, sticking to the Charter, then I possibly would like to revisit voting for it.

But as it is written in this particular report, I stand here and ask you to turn it down.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, okay. So then we have the classic debate. Do you decide on the details of something and then vote on it, or do you decide first whether you want to do it and then you decide what the details are going to be.

I was hoping I’d get some input as to when you want to meet, how many people should be there, should we add a facilitator or not? Who’s going to -- so you’re saying somebody else should come up with this.

Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: No. My feeling, Mr. Speaker, I’ve already expressed that my feelings are that a Charter Review Committee is pretty well spelled out in the current Charter. And if we intend on having a 15-member Charter Review Committee, that’s an elaborate undertaking.

And then it’s mentioned a facilitator. Is that a hired legal counsel? Is that a person from the general public? I mean this is a never done before pretty elaborate meeting. And, quite frankly, I don’t feel comfortable on saying move forward with it until I do get some more information on how exactly and what exactly we’re going to be doing.

Speaker BERGSTROM: What I’m telling --

Mr. CAKOUNES: It’s a Charter Review Committee. Why don’t we just do what the Charter already says?

Speaker BERGSTROM: The information is not out there in cyberspace. It’s not like we’re calling the government. We create the information. We’re the ones who are forming this.

So to say you’re going to sit back and you’re going to wait for somebody to tell you something, you’re the guy who’s supposed to be doing the telling.

Okay. Anyway. Marcia.

Ms. KING: I disagree, Mr. Speaker. I agree with Leo. The Charter tells us exactly what a Charter Committee is. This is not -- we’re actually going against the Charter Committee.

I also in deference to the Delegate from Truro who at the beginning of our meeting read a statement that was a little surprising from one of our Commissioners; already got a little irritated and previously another Commissioner said that we don’t do anything and a few other things.

Put all 18 of us in a room, I’m not sure it’s a good idea. I think the Charter tells you

how to do it by committee. I think some people are going to change on this board and on the other board on January 1.

You know, I'm going to support Leo and vote down this recommendation. I think the Commissioners are a little bit hostile at the moment and we might be too. I'm not sure.

So I think we should just let this go and maybe let the new session in January take care of this. Or at least we should follow the Charter as it is now, and I agree with Leo. I think what we're doing is against the Charter, so I will support Leo.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, I think the problem is we called it a Charter Review Committee. I mean it's not officially a Charter Review Committee.

You can call it anything you want. We only have about 60 percent of us in there, so, obviously, any motion with any disagreement is going to fail.

So, yes. Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: We're under discussion still. I'm going to vote against this as well. I thought I was really clear what I'd love to see. I hope I was but I'll say it again. I would love to see at least you, Ron, with all the years you've served on the Assembly outline in very simple terms what sections of the Charter you feel are not being -- Suzanne used the word "enforced"; I would just say followed and tell us why you feel we should follow them. Because clearly either we should follow them or we should change the Charter.

And I respect your opinion. I might agree with it or I might not. But if you could lay out a memo and say, "Here are the sections that right now are not being followed and here's why I think we should." I think it would be a real important exercise for all of us to understand what sections of the Charter aren't being followed.

Because, right now, I don't know what that means. Does that mean we should be following them as written or does it mean we should be looking to see them changed? And I don't know.

So, before I meet with the Commissioners or anyone else, that's what I was hoping - - that was the information that I was hoping you'd be able to give us.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, I had no problem reading the Charter and seeing we're not doing things or doing things. I think everyone of us should be reading the Charter. I think everyone of us should be familiar with well, gee, that doesn't happen or gee, yeah, this should work differently.

I think we should all take this on. I think that this is not just something to give to a committee. And I wasn't joking when I said a focus group. I think that it would not hurt the Assembly and the Commissioners to work together in a less formal governmental fashion where people are drawing lines and people are getting sort of formal and intentional and to have discussions as people back and forth about, gee, do you think this is worthwhile part of the Charter? Do you think you want to do it? And then we'll know up front whether we're going to get reports or whether we're going to get capital budgets, whether we're going to get things.

I don't think that it necessarily needs to be so formalized as to go to a Charter Review Committee, lengthen the process, put, you know, there are just not that many -- if you go through and read, there are just about not that many paragraphs that jump out at me that I think need attention. And I think working together as people and not a formal, huge governmental function might move us closer together.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I am, not surprisingly, in agreement with Leo on this one. I would like to point out that we all do -- I do think we do -- I agree with Ms. McAuliffe.

Speaker BERGSTROM: The Delegate from Yarmouth.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: The Delegate from Yarmouth. I agree that everybody ought to read this Charter because, you know, I raised this question about the taxes and then I looked after I got the answer and if you compare what's in the Charter now on page 20 with what was in your report on page 18, they're different.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Okay.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: They're completely rewritten. We all know what we're doing before we try to do it with somebody else.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Exactly. Correct.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, I guess, you know I can see where this is going but I have the problem is that if -- the Charter says that the Assembly has to approve all borrowing. Now anybody remember Mark or the Commissioners coming for us with an Ordinance to borrow any money?

Ms. KING: No.

Speaker BERGSTROM: They don't think they have to do that. So they're going to continue to not do that because it's their interpretation of the Charter.

Now what are we going to about that? If we -- my only thing is we sit down with them and we come to -- not come to blows on this but come to some kind of understanding with the facilitator and with professional help, County counsel and maybe counsel to the Assembly that when we leave the room we understand what we're doing.

But right now, they're going to do whatever they want. We're going to do whatever we want. If we don't like what they're doing, that's just too bad. Okay. I'm just explaining it to you. I'm not complaining. I'm just telling you that's the way it is now. And if it's going to change, we're going to have to change it. And if this is not going to change it, you guys are going to have come with something else. Okay. That's all I'm saying.

So, anyway, I think we're ready to vote on this.

Clerk O'CONNELL: There's a motion and a second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Motion and a second.

Mr. ANDERSON: I didn't hear a second.

Ms. KING: No, we seconded it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It was seconded over there somewhere.

Clerk O'CONNELL: All right. You didn't do a roll call vote on "C". I don't know if you're going to do it or not on "D".

Speaker BERGSTROM: No. We'll just take a voice vote. Okay. All those in favor, say "Aye." Opposed?

The DELEGATES: No.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well the motion fails because we need --

Mr. CAKOUNES: The motion carries, you mean?

Speaker BERGSTROM: The motion carries; yes.

Mr. OHMAN: Point of order; can we have a --

Speaker BERGSTROM: Have a vote?

Mr. OHMAN: -- a roll call vote.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Sure. Yes, we should get one.

Mr. OHMAN: There are only 61 percent of us here today.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Oh, that's right. Wait a minute. The motion doesn't carry.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Why?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Because you made a motion to reject something; right?

Ms. ANDREWS: That's right.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Mr. Speaker, my motion was that we reject "Recommendation D, a Joint Meeting of the Assembly of Delegates and the Board of County Commissioners."

Speaker BERGSTROM: You need 51 percent of the votes to carry your motion to reject it. So, let's have a roll call vote.

Clerk O'CONNELL: All right.

Roll Call Vote on motion to reject Recommendation D, which is to hold a joint meeting of the Assembly of Delegates and Board of Commissioners with a facilitator as described in the Charter Review Committee's report dated May 7, 2014.

Voting YES (27.17%): Richard Anderson (9.15% - Bourne), Cheryl Andrews (1.36% - Provincetown), Leo Cakounes (5.67% - Harwich), Ned Hitchcock (1.27% - Wellfleet), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro).

Voting NO (30.02%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis).

Voting PRESENT (4.55%): Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster).

Absent (38.26%): Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, the motion as stated failed to pass. You have 27.17 percent voting yes; 30.02 percent no; 4.55 percent present; 38.26 percent absent.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So I think that's an excellent outcome. We'll let this cool a little bit, fester, and simmer and marinate and it will come back to us at some point.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I take it you do not need or want a recommendation or a motion that we accept the report from the Charter Review Committee?

Speaker BERGSTROM: That's a good question. I don't think we need one.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Okay. Then one other thing just to follow-up, if I may, because you did ask and where there was such a heated discussion on this; one thing I just want to remind people that my motion was the recommendation as it printed in this report.

And I certainly would support a workshop, a workshop where we got an attorney to come in and put a PowerPoint presentation up of our current Charter, went through each and every article explaining to us the legal ramifications of that, educating us.

And if that has to be done in two or three meetings, then I think that might be something that we should all attend including the County Commissioners.

And I do have one other question, if I may, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Clerk?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Could you tell us, by any chance, what we have left in our attorney fee account that was allocated for the Charter Review Committee? If you don't

have that now, if the Clerk could get that for me later.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Zero.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Thank you.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We spent it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Where are we now? Okay. Do we have a Report from the Clerk?

Report from the Clerk

Clerk O'CONNELL: A few items this week. I had a conversation with the Speaker before the beginning of this meeting, and I'd like to try to schedule at the next meeting a short presentation from the IT Web Department along with myself to show you all the improvements in the County's website and more specifically the Assembly's piece. So that the constituents who are watching and anyone else in the audience as well as Delegates will have a very clear understanding of where everything is living and why it lives there.

Ms. ANDREWS: I couldn't find the Charter.

Clerk O'CONNELL: It's there.

Ms. ANDREWS: I gave up. I Googled it.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I think that's a really good idea.

Clerk O'CONNELL: And I have an appreciation for trying to locate something and not finding it. And I can tell you that I had quite a few spirited discussions with IT and, admittedly, I had to compromise. And I do understand that because I am not a specialist in that area. I defer to others who are and can show me in documentation where these types of documents are supposed to live in a particular category on a page in a location where I guess most normal people, and I guess I'm probably not, would go to locate them.

And that doesn't mean to say that it's going to be that way forever, but I was willing to compromise and give it a shot. And maybe when you hear the presentation piece from the IT specialists, you may get more of an understanding, like I, where and why some things have to live where they live on that page.

So if we have an agenda that will allow it, that's what we will do on the 18th.

And the only other item is I just want to let everyone know that I really do appreciate it when you are able to let me know that you've got a complication in your schedule and you're not able to attend the meeting, especially as we start to get into the summer months now with vacations and other commitments that you all may have. When you can let me know that it's not going to be possible to attend, I appreciate it because it could impact the ability of the Assembly to have a quorum.

And that's it. That's all I have for today.

Other Business

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Any other business to be brought before the Assembly?

Mr. CAKOUNES: I have something, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I know you all probably got a copy of this in an email, but I want to bring it up to your attention again.

On May 29, 2014, the Cape Light Compact motioned the Department of Public Utilities to actually strike portions of comments provided by individuals in regards to their review of the DP Review of their New Management Plan.

And I just want to make -- bring to your attention that if you have a problem with that request to, in fact, asking this department to strike their comments that your comments can be made to them by June 6, 2014, and I believe that's Friday.

So I just wanted to draw that to your attention. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. I had one other thing to say and just because it has to do with what Deborah brought up at the beginning of the meeting, which is Mr. or Commissioner Doherty's impolitic comments.

I was ready to let them go because he's made dumb remarks before. And this isn't the first time. But, you know, I mean so I don't know if it calls for a response from the Assembly but maybe we'll hear from Mr. Doherty that he regrets his remarks.

But the idea that he would -- that if we take a vote the Commissioners don't like, they're going to retaliate against our towns is a very, very serious thing to say in public.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We'll see where that goes.

Ms. ANDREWS: It made the rounds.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Thank you. I appreciate that remark because I found it quite disturbing.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Anyway, so --

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 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O'Connell, Clerk
Assembly of Delegates