

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT
ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES**

APPROVED Journal of Proceedings – February 1, 2012

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Let's get started here. It's four o'clock. Ron is temporarily disposed, so we're going to run the meeting until he gets here.

Mr. CAKOUNES: He's not coming.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: He's not coming back?

Mr. CAKOUNES: No.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Well, I'll run the meeting the rest of the day then.

The first order is 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. Please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

Thank you. We have the Call of the Roll by the Clerk, please.

Roll Call (89.88%): 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), Thomas Lynch (20.92% - Barnstable), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Spyro Mitrokostas (11.02% - Yarmouth), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Paul Pilcher (1.27% - Wellfleet), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth).

Absent (10.12%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% Orleans), Anthony Scalese (4.55% - Brewster).

Ms. O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, we have a quorum present with 89.88 percent of the Delegates present and 10.12 percent of the Delegates absent.

Committee of the Whole

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you. The next item is the Approval of the Calendar of Business.

Ms. KING: So moved.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Second?

Mr. OHMAN: Second.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Moved and seconded. All in favor say "aye." Opposed. None. Okay.

We need Approval of the Journal of January 18, 2012.

Ms. KING: So moved.

Delegate OHMAN: Second.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Moved and seconded. All in favor say "aye." Opposed. All right.

Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners. Chairman Flynn, good afternoon.

Communication from the Board of Regional Commissioners

Commissioner FLYNN: Good afternoon. Very brief comments today. The commissioners had their fourth tour of what we always refer to as the old jail. We have to come up with a better name for that place. There are a lot of improvements there, particularly regarding the health lab, and I know the subcommittee heard some of that earlier this afternoon. That project is moving forward. IT is over there. As you know, DEP is occupying some space on a temporary basis. But there is a great opportunity there, and I think the commissioners will be holding a workshop among themselves and a few others to take a look at future planning for that building because we believe that it could be a source of revenue for the county as well.

Other services might be able to be utilized in that building, and would be paying rent. So that's not a bad thing.

So if you haven't been there, I would really encourage you to contact John in Facilities Management, and I'm sure he'd be happy to give you a tour. I think the renovations have, and the restructuring, has worked very well. The offices that are there, they are well appointed. They are calm. I think they are pretty well temperature-controlled and they are quiet, and you just go around corners and find people and they have nice office space and so far it looks pretty good. So it's worth taking a tour just to see where things are now and the planning that is being done for the health lab, which will make a huge difference in terms of the services that we provide to the towns on Cape Cod from the health department.

In relation to the budget, we continue to massage our numbers, and we are coming in with a budget that will be less than this year obviously. And Mark is still waiting for some other figures to come in, but we will have it to you on time, and we will make a presentation like we did last year. I think you probably found it pretty helpful, at least I think so. We found it helpful anyway in being able to not just hand you a letter in a package and say, here it is, folks, but actually to be able to present to you some of the thinking behind the budget.

Some of the rationale as to why things are what they are, why certain areas were reduced, why some stayed the same.

So we will do that again on February 15th. The tour that we took this morning, thanks to Steve, is on video -- is on the commissioner's meeting video. So you can actually look at it yourself in the privacy of your own home if you choose to, and not make the tour.

That concludes my comments.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Thank you. Any questions for the commissioner? Yes, Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: Pat, I know you have attended some of the meetings of your commission group that's looking into county government with suggestions with your budget. I'm just thinking off the top of my head. There was a lot of conversation about the RUSS and there was a lot of conversation about 911. Is there any chance that any of that might appear in the next budget?

Commissioner FLYNN: You will find a line item. I think we decided today we will just call the regional services, a line item for about \$75,000. That will begin the seed money, if you will, for the RUSS if in fact we go in that direction.

I spoke to Dan Gallagher today and I am meeting with Mark tomorrow. We are going to plan a strategic planning session for next week on the RUSS so that the county commissioners can make a decision as to whether or not this is something that we believe that we should enter into. Obviously Dan and some of the others who are involved with OpenCape believe that this is an absolutely viable option for the county to do, this regional umbrella service, and it will also be another sustainable source of income for the county because it will be sort of like the strategic information center. It will be more of a coordinated data system of information that will be available to the communities, and communities will be able to access this, and there will be a fee in order to do that.

So it will really help communities tremendously, I think. The ePermitting, when that project moves farther along, that could be another source of revenue for the county, where the county, you know, because they are handling the whole ePermitting would actually maybe charge a small insignificant fee, but over the number of permits that could be issued Cape-wide would be significant. And it would also improve the efficiencies in town hall, and not that you want to necessarily lose people, but it may turn out that people's jobs could be restructured in some way, or maybe they won't need as many people. As people retire, then jobs could be restructured in some way and significant efficiencies achieved.

So we are going to take up the RUSS next week and hopefully come to a decision as to where we want to go with that project. Did I answer your question, all of it?

Ms. TAYLOR: That's just what I wanted to know.

Commissioner FLYNN: I don't want to just go on and on. But I'm really excited about that. This is going to create the kind of sustainable, viable county that we really would like to see, a county, you know, that has a purpose, that has significance, that contributes and that is able to help the towns get their job done in a really quality way.

I mean, I think the whole objective of this is really quality. Efficiency also is important, but quality is really what is the driving force here and having that strategic data center, you know IBM, as you know, is partnered with us on this strategic information center. Paul calls it the strategic information center. Dan calls it combined data information system. But whatever it is, it's the same thing. It's information all in one place available to everybody.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Anything else? John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really appreciate the work that you have done on the 2013 budget, but I'm also very concerned about the 2012 budget. We have a serious gap, and time is drawing very close, and some of that 2013 budget is based on projections that may or may not come to fruition through the Registry of Deeds.

So, for example, I think we are projecting now there's going to be seven million dollars coming in from the Registry of Deeds side of the budget. There are many indications we may not reach that. So my first question is Number One, how have you done matching up with the expenses going forward for the rest of the year with the projected budget shortfalls, and if the Registry of Deeds is predicting only --predicts 6.4 million again this year as some people would think, including myself, what does that do for your projections of seven million for 2013 as a revenue source.

Commissioner FLYNN: Well, we talked about that a little bit again today. We want to wait a little longer. The numbers for January we will have tomorrow from the Registry of Deeds. Not that one month can necessarily make a huge difference.

But we are very much aware of that and we discussed today if we are predicating our 2013 budget on 2012. We don't really know yet exactly how 2012 is going to work out. 2013 is

actually projected to be less than 2012 was budgeted for. The question is where that is in relation to how 2012 will actually come out. So that's -- we are going to massage that over the next couple of weeks. I have asked Mark when he makes the presentation on the budget to bring that up, to take a look at this year and actually make this year's numbers more relevant so that when you look at next year's numbers, you'll be able to make that determination.

Mr. OHMAN: So have there been any hard cuts made from the 2012 budget for unexpended ---

Commissioner FLYNN: No. I have had several conversations with Mark about this. Those of you, who work in towns, Tom, probably Julie, and others, know there are always turn-backs at the end of the year. There is a history of turn-backs and he kind of knows what those are, and most of the time they follow a certain pattern. So I asked him to put together what he thinks some of those turn-backs will be. So there's money that's not going to be spent in this year's budget. We need to get a handle on what that's going to be. So the turn-backs can be pretty significant.

And also the idea of saying to department heads as of a certain date, no more spending. That's just it. So all of this is in place, and it's all being monitored very carefully. But it's important for you and I think for us as well to know, here's what we projected for 2012. We know we are not going to have that revenue. So we need to have a new projection for the year. So that when we compare -- when we look at next year we can see what the relevance is to next year from this year, and are we being realistic.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Anybody else?

Commissioner FLYNN: Thank you very much.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Thank you. Okay. Communications from Public Officials. None.

Communications from Members of the Public. Yes, ma'am. Just state your name, please, for the record.

Communications from the Public

Ms. SHERMAN: Kathy Sherman from Brewster. I just wanted to very briefly, and this is a segue into the conversation about regionalization and the information to say that on February 8th and Representative Taylor might have more information, but they are going to be discussing CVEC and CLC I think a little bit more, but also looking forward in terms of possibly having a regional utility, and I think that's something that especially, you know, where we are right now, I think would be very important to have as much input as possible into, you know, directions and things like that from members that could come or from community people that might be interested. Thank you.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Thank you. Okay. Well, that clears that part of the agenda. So now we go to the Assembly Convened. Number 12 is Report of Committees, Special Commission on County Governance. Yes, Ms. Taylor.

Assembly Convenes

Report of Committees

Special Commission on County Governance

Ms. TAYLOR: As she said, there was discussion -- I was trying to write down my new email address before I lost my piece of paper I just got. That's really county business I was fooling with.

Leo was there but I think maybe he had to leave before we finally got to the part about CVEC and CLC. Maggie made a presentation, as did the chair of CVEC, and I would say it was an extremely well-received presentation by the people there. They were very favorably impressed and one guy, one of the town managers there, spoke about that this is exactly what we want Barnstable County to be doing. This is the kind of project we are totally interested in the county pursuing, etc., etc. And while I have forgotten who is going to write up something about the recommendation for the commission to make on that aspect, someone is going to write it up and it's going to be saying something along those lines, would be my guess.

What else happened. There wasn't anything vital. We are supposedly going to finish up some of these recommendations on -- oh, presentation by Human Services, Beth Albert, and she made a nice presentation. I think possibly some people already had an idea on this topic before the beginning of these meetings. There seems to be an appetite for requesting that the county form a joint health and human services department on the theory that a lot of health issues are connected with human service issues. That was Cheryl Bartlett who seems to work now in the health field state, who's definitely pushing this and everybody was nodding politely.

So if others have a very strong view about that, do let me know because that will come up at the next meeting for some sort of formulation and comments on whether that's going to be a recommendation.

So that meeting is supposedly next on the 8th. We'll finish up all these recommendations about what the county should be doing. Of course, we haven't even gotten to the topic of the waste water. But I think that there's going to be an appetite for saying that the county should be involved in that, but in what way, that's not clear to me.

Did I mention that the town managers group presented a paper?

Mr. OHMAN: No.

Ms. TAYLOR: We just got that. Okay. So you've seen that. So all this stuff will be finished up on the 8th.

Then in a very annoying decision, instead of meeting on the 15th or on the 22nd, a Wednesday, it was decided to meet on the 16th, which is a Thursday, for the discussion of structure. Unfortunately, I will not be in town on the 16th. Knowing that this would be -- that kind of change would be made, I am guessing based on what I've heard that there's going to be a recommendation, as I think I have said already, that we go to a five or seven-person board with a strong administrator, no commissioners as we know them now, and no assembly as we know it now.

I am not utterly opposed to that and wouldn't speak strongly against it. So people who are very strong on that subject probably need to try and get on the agenda of that meeting because I won't even be there. I will however present my view in writing, which is that it would be a mistake to get bogged down in changing the structure when you could in fact simply

implement a lot of MMA recommendations about management and reorganization and undertake some of these really quite important plans for work that the county would do, which I don't personally feel are very dependent on whether you had three commissioners or seven commissioners or an assembly or no assembly. I don't see that as being important to those projects, but apparently some people do, and I think that's what's going to be recommended.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Any questions for Julia? Any comments. John.

Mr. OHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I read this Cape Cod Municipal Manager position, Barnstable County Government Structure, and was quite disturbed by it actually. Was this subset of the committee that gets presented or was it just ---

Ms. TAYLOR: This was just handed out, and a few of the things brought up because we already talked about them or they were part of the idea what should the county be doing. Services. The structure question has really not been discussed at all and is going to be discussed at this meeting on the 18th.

I think that one part of that is ridiculous where they are talking about five districts and representatives and two at-large people. I really think that's -- I can't even imagine why they'd want to do that. So I don't know where that idea came from, and again, I will put in some written comments. I would certainly speak, you know, right against that. What were you thinking that's particularly ---

Mr. OHMAN: My specific thought process, number one, you take this on its face value, there's got to be a way to pay for this. And that should be on the other side of the page or on page two, and there's been no demonstration in any way to pay for this incredible ---

Ms. TAYLOR: Pay for what, the structure?

Mr. OHMAN: Pay for all of the improvements to county government that is being proposed.

Ms. TAYLOR: They haven't really dealt with that, but there was a discussion of would people be willing to increase revenues and, yes, there will be some sort of recommendation for that. So I don't think they are going to have a perfect plan for it, but there are -- let's just say at least they are not going to say we want this and this and this taken on, but no new taxes. That's not going to be part of that, the outcome. But whether it's going to be realistic, that's another issue, and it's definitely not time, as they are currently talking about having only these two more meetings. There's not going to be time to explore in great detail the idea of what you would do to get more money. On the other hand, this is theoretically a report for the commissioners. So it would be their job, you know, figure out these new ---

Mr. OHMAN: Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the last meeting, but I went to several before that. And they were going to take up -- perfunctorily taking up some of those issues, a new county tax, or an expanded county tax. They did bring it up on the table. So you're telling me they didn't follow through on any of those thought processes the next meeting at all?

Ms. TAYLOR: Not that I heard, and I was there. And I don't see when that could happen because I have been told that we just have two more meetings, one of which is to tidy up all these recommendations. Now that might come up. There might be some language being drafted by some people as to what the revenue suggestions would be, but it's going to not be in detail, that's for sure. Unless they've decided to have more meetings, but I don't think so.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Tom.

Mr. LYNCH: Yes. On the structure, was it your sense that if they were to move to a five or seven-member board that they would be elected at-large or would in fact reflect districts?

Ms. TAYLOR: Since we really never talked about it, I would hesitate to say. I'm just getting the sense that they are ready to make that kind of change. If we have any views on that, I suppose we better put them in.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Yes. John.

Mr. OHMAN: I'd just like to point out that a town manager was asking that question about the town manager's report.

Ms. LYNCH: No. I was asking the question on her sense of the group.

Ms. TAYLOR: We've seen what the town -- now, if I were to have any say in it, it's not going to be for me, I would certainly not be in favor of at-large. I would be in favor of districts. I would also, and I will point out in whatever I write up, that unless their recommendations included a significant role that we thought would really happen for say town managers, then I think they are giving up something by going to just districts.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Anything else? Yes. Go ahead, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I did attend the meeting. I went because I saw on the agenda the CVEC and CLC presentation and after I sat for about an hour and-a-half, I guess that I stayed there, I realized I had to be somewhere else. Plus the forum of the meeting I think wasn't going to lend itself for me to add anything plus or minus to their presentation. I guess I went in case someone had a specific question of me, a member of that inquiry committee, if you will, and I just brought with me the original resolution and I think I left it with Sheila or somebody there to pass out if anyone had a question on that specifically, but -- if you want to comment on that, but I have other views too.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I just -- I forgot. I did ask Maggie the question which was if CLC, I sort of pointed out that she pointed out there were certain like problem in perception of this separation between CLC and county, and that that was due primarily to her having taken the position when she was first promoting the CLC that this was a way to get the county more promoted because here was somebody in Barnstable County kind of invisible often, was doing, and now it's this huge organization, and the county can certainly take the credit for it.

However, that of course has its, you know, reverse aspect. But I did ask the question if the county, let's say, Maggie weren't working for the county and just worked for CLC say, does one of the CLC parties, the towns and the two counties or three counties, 15 towns and the three counties, more than that, but at any rate, does one of those groups in this inter-municipal agreement have to be the fiscal agent for the operation, and the answer is yes.

So my comment then was from my point of view that if that is the case, and I can understand exactly why it would be, then it certainly seemed correct that the county would be the fiscal agent.

The issue of county employees serving on these boards is a different issue. Elected county officials serving on these boards is also in my view a different issue, but I don't think that the idea of county -- there's lots of pros and cons to those things. But I think as far as serving as fiscal agent it makes perfect sense that it would be the county. It should be the county and I would continue to support that for sure.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Again, I left before the CLC and CVEC made their presentation, because I just felt it was the improper forum for me to stay there unless there was some specific question they wanted me to answer.

With that said, I think that whether we do the CLC and CVEC report, if something comes out of that committee and this special committee is still formed, I think they should get a copy of it. But again, that's the reason why, plus I had somewheres to go.

More importantly that I took out of that meeting was two things. First of all, you mentioned briefly about the human services, and I believe it was the affordable housing committee. They got up and made a nice presentation, and I just think it was kind of ironic that here these organizations have very limited funds doing so much for not only for Barnstable County residents, and that it was even still the sentiment that, well, maybe we should fool with them too and put them together. And these presentations I listened to, all they kept saying how they work with each other, how they work together, how they don't do redundancies. How one will go and help a family on this issue and then if they need help somewhere else, they refer them for help on the other issue. Yet this committee still felt that in their needs to say well, you know, why don't we suggest that we combine them under -- I think they suggested they put them under the County Extension Service, like Bill Clark needs to have those two organizations under him. Just kind of a rhetorical thing, I thought it was kind of funny that someone thought of that.

Ms. TAYLOR: I don't remember them talking about County Extension being in charge. But I don't disagree with you, Leo. Some of these things are more thought out than others.

Mr. CAKOUNES: The only other thing I came away with is the white sheet. I will refer it as a white sheet the town administrators came up with. I absolutely think it's very important for the Assembly of Delegates to produce a white sheet also. I think we need to belly up to the table, have this knock-down, drag-out conversation, and take a vote and produce a very simple white sheet. Because shy of that, we either are going to go to these meetings as individuals giving what we think should happen or maybe going there and maybe being perceived that we are talking to the entire assembly, which I know a lot of times -- every time, he's speaking for the whole assembly. That's not the case. I am there as an individual. But I just think after seeing that and kind of being a little concerned how this committee may be heading, I really think it's pertinent that we as an assembly produce our own white sheet for this subcommittee, whatever it is. But we really need to produce something and take a vote on it.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, you do, because as I say I'm not even going to be there. So I can't even present what I think the assembly might want, if I knew for sure, and I don't think my views are necessarily -- I wouldn't say that my views do represent the assembly. So it is I think important that you think about that.

Ms. McCutcheon: Just so I'm clear.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Yes. Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: You can't be there on the 16th, but you are going to be here on the 15th?

Ms. TAYLOR: (Shaking head affirmatively.)

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: It would seem to me that the last opportunity to do something is to put it on the agenda for our next meeting, and who is going ---

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: I think this could take a little bit of time and a little bit of effort. I think it should come up under the direction of the Speaker, and if you feel comfortable siding on his behalf, I think it should be he that abrogates all of our comments and tries to come up with some structure for that conversation. It might take, you know, half an hour next time; might take an hour. But if we are all trying to get our opinion included into a white paper, it's going to not produce a white paper. The chair's prerogative.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: All right. Thank you, Spyro. Go ahead, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I am not sure if, you know, we are making too much out of this. I think I could certainly go home in the next week, jot down on a piece of paper my general thoughts where we need to head with this. I mean, we don't need to get into the particulars.

Either as an individual, you either support a structure such as the administrators have put out. You either support that we do nothing and leave it as it is because you feel it's working as it is, or I will throw my idea out which I've had before, which is I personally support leaving the structure as it is and going from three county commissioners to five, but leaving the rest of the structure as it is.

The internal stuff, I really go back to the MMA report that we'll be talking about later. The internal stuff does need to be looked at, but I'm not concerned for us having all that nitty-gritty internal stuff being on our -- and I've been corrected -- the term is white paper, having it listed on white paper. I really feel comfortable that we can go away and in two weeks from now come back with some very basic things, put them out there, I mean -- God, we've voted on budgets in one day, with 15 different amendments, that we've gotten through it. Certainly think that we have the intelligence to put together -- again, if we keep our focus on the major structure of county government and not on the day-to-day operation stuff, I think we can do it next week or the next time we meet.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Thank you, Leo. Anybody else? Tom.

Mr. LYNCH: I guess I somewhat argue the white paper, you know, position paper from the assembly. I think we remain an objective body to take a look at this report. We should see it. I have not attended any of them. I'm very eager to see how they synthesize everyone else's, you know, position papers. You have one that you're referring to today. I am sure the Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce has one. I'm sure there are other business groups out there that have them, and I think we maintain a high level of objectivity. If we can take that and then respond to what's there, or if the county commissioners are going to give us their thinking on that and then ask for a response. I'd just rather not compromise ourselves with a position that we have without even seeing the report that, you know, the committee's been charged to produce.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Thank you, Tom. Anybody else? Go ahead, Debra.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: So I understand, I get confused here. I get a little confused here, the process. Let's assume this committee comes out with a recommendation along the lines that has been outlined by the managers. What's the next step? Does that come to us? Goes to the commissioners and then what happens?

Ms. TAYLOR: What I would think would be that the commissioners will look over the report and certainly want to make some sort of response to it at some point. If that response included changing the structure of government, that would require a charter change. Ordinarily charter changes then -- so somebody, either the commissioners or some other group might want to propose a charter change. So we are kind of a long way, not a long way, but not -- the 16th is not the last we're ever going to hear about this. The voters could propose a charter change because it's non-partisan. And then that would ordinarily come to us to put it to be voted on positively, to put it on the ballot. If we didn't vote it positively, it wouldn't go on the ballot from that route and would have to be pursued a different route, which would be some sort of signature route.

So what Tom is suggesting isn't a crazy idea. I mean, I think -- I'm sympathetic ---

Mr. LYNCH: Thank you, Julia. That's the first time today someone said I wasn't proposing a crazy thing.

Ms. TAYLOR: That could be an excellent idea. I'm just saying that if people want to have some say and put something out now, it's got to be soon because the 16th in theory is when this whole structure thing is going to be decided, and then I'm not going to be able to be any kind of a help. I am not going to be there. But I think that what Tom is saying is definitely worth

considering because if there's going to be a charter change suggested by either the commissioners or some other group, it would initially probably come to us, or I suppose someone could avoid that altogether and just go directly for a signature campaign. But that's a lot of work. I don't really see the existing group being interested in doing that. The existing commission, it's possible, but I don't see the majority of them doing it.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I don't think your idea is crazy either, Tom. I mean, what I would like to do though is maybe take a poll of finding out how the rest of us do feel. Because I can go either way. My point is that after having gone to that meeting, just sat there a little while and listening to them, seeing some of the stuff, I said, well, maybe it might be better for us to be on record. But if the rest of you feel as if you don't want to be and wait until after they come up with a report, I can go either way. I would ask, Mr. Chairman or Mr. Speaker, that if you at least take a poll of the people present and how they want to proceed.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: All right.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Unless you think it prudent that I should make a motion and if the motion fails, we obviously know what the people ---

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: I think that would be the way to go, Leo, but I think Spyro has something he wants to say.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: I just wanted to request that whatever we do next, this is on the agenda for the next meeting, so that it doesn't get kind of lost and truncated at this -- at today's meeting.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. If we have a motion to see how the people feel about it, then there's no sense of putting it -- so we'll have to go after the vote. Spyro, does that make sense to you?

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Sure.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: All right. Cheryl?

Ms. ANDREWS: I just have a question.

Ms. KING: Is there a motion on the floor?

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: No.

Ms. ANDREWS: I just have a question for anyone that has attended these meetings or the managers meeting or any of the other groups that have already expressed opinions, and the question is this. Any of these groups who have suggested, for example, not having an Assembly of Delegates, have they followed that up or accompanied that up with an explanation of why? And that's where I get stymied because I don't know how I feel because I haven't heard the argument either way.

I know that every town on Cape Cod, with the exception of the largest, has maintained a separate legislature from an executive board, and looking at our budget we are comparable to a small town as opposed to a large one. So, you know, from looking at all the towns, it seems like the towns, they don't want their selectmen being able to approve a budget. They want to have another group do it as well for them.

So the idea that you would take away that check and balance system, that's profound. That's pretty intriguing and, you know, obviously I wouldn't be sitting at this table if I didn't think it was important to have a check and balance system in government. But I'd like to hear one of these groups that is suggesting that we don't have an assembly, that we just have an expanded county commissioners, I'd like them to explain why, and that's what I was wondering if any of these groups ---

Ms. TAYLOR: I think I know what some of the arguments are. I could be mistaken. But I think one argument is that the new five or seven person isn't really an executive. It is the legislature then, and that the strong manager administrator is really the executive, and so people who are looking for a stream-lined efficient dynamic, bum, bum, we are going to get everything done, that would be their concept of how that would happen. They might see the assembly as sort of too parochial, too interfering, too, I don't know. I mean, you know, I don't see that problem myself exactly. And then there's the problem that you got -- on the one hand, you've got all these littles, there's 15 of them. And so there's all these people cluttering up the business from the small towns, and then you've got the problem of the great big towns, especially Barnstable, Barnstable and Falmouth having their way. So, you know, it doesn't really -- it's not, I wouldn't say, an entirely rational position as to what the problem that the assembly has created is. That isn't in my view well articulated, but I think the theory is that this is just an anachronism that doesn't make for efficient, speedy, great, dynamic, forward-moving ---

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Mr. Speaker.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Hold on a second, Spyro.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: I don't think we should be speculating on the answer that the delegate from Provincetown requested that the proponent make. So unless the proponent is in front of us, we are just sort of getting off track here.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Go ahead, Jan.

Mr. LYNCH: If I may, I just want to correct something for the record. Barnstable has legislative and executive functions. The town council is the legislative body akin to your town meeting and the town manager's office functions in that executive and has those executive powers.

Ms. TAYLOR: That's what they are looking for.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Jan. Thank you, Tom.

Clerk O'CONNELL: As you know, I've been here for about a year, and I guess there comes a point in time you have to step out of that box a little bit and take a little bit of risk. And I know I don't know every single rule that is printed in the playbook, but I guess what I want to say is I don't think it's a good idea to take a vote on any motions today with regards to this topic.

The main reason is this is a report of committees. There was no notice placed on the agenda that you were going to be taking any kind of votes having to do with any recommendations to this commission, and I just think it's treading on thin ice. I just don't think it's a good idea, and that's my two cents.

Mr. CAKOUNES: You win, Tom, once again by default.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Everybody said what they wanted to say on County Governance? All right. Special Committee ---

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Excuse me. Is that going to be on the agenda for the next meeting?

Ms. TAYLOR: Yes.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Okay. I'm in.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Yes. All right. Special Committee on Inquiry into CLC and CVEC. Does anybody want to report on that? Any of the members.
Leo.

Special Committee on Inquiry into CLC & CVEC

Mr. CAKOUNES: Today was February 1st and we held our quasi-public hearing. I am going to refer it as a public meeting. It was a forum in which the public was allowed to come and give testimony. A letter went out and along with the letter went the actual resolution that created the subcommittee. We asked that people keep their comments to the purpose of the subcommittee's review.

I have to report I think it went excellent. I do have my notes. There might have been 15, maybe a little less than that.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: Twelve.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Twelve people that got up and spoke. Some of their points were relevant to the issue; some weren't. But I think all in all it went very well. The way the committee ended was that we are going to have another meeting, attempt to put together a report or tally some further questions that we may have, and then submit that to both CVEC and CLC for their direct response before we do a final tally or report and give it to the entire assembly. So we are moving forward. I don't think any other major issues came up today that need to be reported, other than again it was the public forum we promised we would have.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I would just add a couple of things to that. First of all, my understanding was we were going to give them, once we had the draft report, we were going to give it to them and have a meeting with them, where they would have an opportunity to discuss it with us rather than, you know, exchanging papers back and forth. Then we would then promulgate a final report.

The other thing I have got to say, I thought it was pretty interesting, was that Mr. McLaughlin, who is the President of CVEC, today was very encouraging about having a meeting to discuss whatever our findings were. But also made an offer to us to allow and in-camera examination of their executive session, CVEC's executive session minutes, which I thought was kind of — I thought he was quite forthcoming. I thought he was quite forthcoming. Some of the people who spoke were a little angry at the committee and then didn't want to answer any questions or have any feedback. That was a little difficult. I think overall I agree with Leo it was a very productive meeting, and there was I thought some good information and some things were clarified.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, Leo.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Can I just follow up with that. Last time we gave a report, one of the assembly members asked for the names of the executive committees of both CVEC and CLC. I just went through the paperwork a little earlier. So for the record, for those people who haven't found out, CVEC Executive Committee is Barry Worth, who's from Harwich, Maggie Downey, she's actually from CLC, Mark Zielinsky, from the county, Charlie McLaughlin from the Town of Barnstable, and Kitt Johnson from Edgartown; and the CLC, Cape Light Compact Executive Committee is Robert Schofield from Bourne, Kitt Johnson from Edgartown, Barry Worth from Harwich, Bill Doherty is down as the Chair, and I believe Maggie, both Maggie and Mark have a position on that also.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Anything else on the CLC, CVEC? Okay. Next is the Report from the Clerk. Jan.

Report from the Clerk

Clerk O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Quickly, I just want to remind everyone. Actually I think I got signatures from everyone that you received a copy of the conflict of interest information. We are required to do that as an employer - to make sure you all get a copy of that. Thank you for signing that, and I'll get the people that are missing next week. Be on alert - I think you'll be getting an email about doing the conflict of interest online. I don't think that they have finalized the program yet because they've got some changes. So just an alert.

With regards to the budget review schedule, this is like my pre-game, rah, rah, rah, pep rally to make sure we are all on board. I sent it to you in the electronic packet. I had to do a few little tweaks to it, but I think we are good to go and it looks like starting February 29th we will be meeting every Wednesday concluding on hopefully the 21st.

I have not listed when the public hearing will be or when you will vote on the budget yet because I'm not sure when that's going to happen yet. I know in the past you have received this and it has specified here's when finance is meeting, here's when the assembly is going to vote on the budget. I can't do that yet. So it will be a few more weeks.

Ms. TAYLOR: Question.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, Julie.

Ms. TAYLOR: Natural Resources are meeting on the 29th, I believe, and I've already heard that Deborah will be out of town. Who else is on that, and are they available for that meeting so we'd have a quorum?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Well, if I can just, on the quorum, we have five on the committee and there will be one absent. So you will still have a quorum.

Ms. TAYLOR: Do we have everybody else able to do it? One, two, who else would that be?

Clerk O'CONNELL: I don't know because I don't have my list right here.

Mr. CAKOUNES: I'll be there.

Ms. TAYLOR: All right. There are three. I think you are. Okay.

Clerk O'CONNELL: If you know you can't make a meeting, please let me know. Because the only way we'll invoke the alternate piece is if we don't have a quorum. and the sooner I know that the better, because it gives the people who are alternates an opportunity to respond and get on board with that date.

Ms. MUCUTCHEON: I will be out of town the 29th. If it appears there's going to be a problem, is there any way that could be on the 7th.

Clerk O'CONNELL: No. We'll make it work. We are going to be positive and going to get it done.

All right. With regards to email accounts, I did notice, I think the majority, everyone who is here filed in and got the information that they needed, and I have some questions with regards to when are they going to kick this off. You notice the theme here. When am I going to kick in this new email account. I will let you know this. When you get yourself set up, once you know you've created this piece, what you need to do on your home system, please let me know so I can check you off my list and I know that you're good to go.

Once I get that information, then I am going to make a determination, okay, here's when we are going to kick it off. Because I really hate to implement you this week, you next week, then someone else, because I know what's going to happen. It's going to become a mess. So I really want to get as many people on board all at once as possible and then kick it off and say all

right, starting now this is, you know, where I'm sending all your information to this particular email account.

Ms. ANDREWS: What do you need from us?

Clerk O'CONNELL: I want to know once you are able to set this up at home, and you're able to sign on, you may create a tab on your home page that you can access it quickly. You don't necessarily have to keep typing in mail at.... You can do a little shortcut.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I thought all we had to do was make a password.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Well, I want you to do it and let me know that it works for you and

Ms. KING: I think all we have to do, you --with the set up. What I think we should all do is go home, log on, and basically send Jan an email saying hi, I'm on. I think that's all you have to do. There's nothing to set up. You just have to log on.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I just want to make sure that it works for everybody. And with regards to -- I guess you've also received a copy of the remote participation policy that the commissioners adopted. I have some questions with regards to the remote participation policy, and what I can tell you is that once you read it you will come to the conclusion that the chair people of these committees have a lot of responsibility with regards to this remote participation policy in terms of what triggers the allowance of it, and until we get a telephone in this room that will work, I don't see remote participation happening like on February 15th, and I don't know exactly when it will. But I don't think using cell phones are a very good idea. We do not have the ability to Skype yet in this room. So I think we are going to have to wait to at the very least we get a telephone connection and we're able to do that type of connection. So stay tuned, and I'll fill you in as I get that information, and I guess that's it.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Any questions for Jan?

Ms. TAYLOR: This is for us?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, Tom.

Mr. LYNCH: Just wondering on the remote participation for the county, you know, impacts us too as a separate legislative entity. We don't have to vote it separately ourselves?

Clerk O'CONNELL: No.

Mr. LYNCH: I wouldn't have any fear using a cell phone, because if we put it on speakerphone. So I don't know as we need to put a land line in here. I kind of think this is the way to go. I'll leave that to your discretion.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I think sometimes the cell phone is not reliable or it'll cut out or you drop a call and it becomes quite complicated in that regard and maybe more so than a land line. But certainly we are open to suggestions. I'm not saying that that's not possible. You try something and if it works, okay; if it doesn't, it doesn't.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Yes, Leo. Go ahead.

Mr. CAKOUNES: Being computer ignorant, why isn't Skype available? Don't we have internet access in this room?

Clerk O'CONNELL: No, we don't.

Ms. MARTIN: I can answer this. I asked this afternoon. All three of the IT folks were standing here. And the access here is in the law library and sometimes it's here and sometimes it isn't here. I asked all three of them, why does it work sometimes and not the other, and the answer was it's the state's lines and they're old and they don't always work. So that's the answer. We don't have it effectively. We may have it accidentally. And nobody knows why.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I tried to get it, but I can't.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: If Steve can broadcast out over the internet, why can't we tap into it? He is sending it out live. That's a live stream. That's a live stream right out to the internet.

Ms. MARTIN: So what are you using?

Mr. BATY (Media Person): It's plugged in right here.

Ms. MARTIN: So there's no reason why you couldn't use it wirelessly.

Mr. BATY (Media Person): There's another one on the other side.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Janice might be correct. We need another two to four weeks to figure it out, and we might have to put in a router. We might have to put a land line, but a month from now we can do remote participation. Can we just trust Janice to figure it out?

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Sure. We'll put that on Janice's shoulders. Okay. Anything else from the Report from the Clerk? All right. Other Business. Discussion on the Fiscal Year 2013 Budget. So we'll turn this over to the finance committee chairman.

Other Business

Discussion on the 2012 Budget Process

Mr. OHMAN: Are we going to open up an entire conversation on the 2013 budget?

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: No. Just like I am assuming someone wanted to have an overview of what was going on.

Clerk O'CONNELL: I can fill in.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Jan.

Clerk O'CONNELL: The speaker asked that this be placed on the agenda again because he realized there was some continuing discussion over the last several sessions with regards to concerns about the budget and the revenues. So he just wanted to have that placed on there in case there was anyone that wanted to speak further about what has already been talked about in the last several sessions. But mindful of the fact that you're getting the 2013 budget at our next meeting.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, John.

Mr. OHMAN: I would let the assembly know and especially the committee chairs that I think that my biggest concern, and I have attended most of all the commissioners' budget hearings, watching the sausage be ground. They are doing a good job over there.

But I have a continuing concern, as I mentioned to Commissioner Flynn earlier, about the construction of the revenue side. So I would like to make sure that all of the committee chairs, as they are going through their individual budget process with each of the department heads, that they ask the level of pain. If we don't reach revenue projections for the full county that what each department head would cut would be the least painful to do that and I wish that all of the committee chairs would do that so we can be responsible. If we don't agree with the revenue projection side, we'll have a definite target group of cuts that we think we should make on the budget in that regard.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Are you talking a percentage or are you just saying ---

Mr. OHMAN: Yeah, I am talking percentage. I'm thinking in terms of 10%. If each department head comes up with a 10% least, not that they want to cut it, but if they have to, what would be the least painful cut you could make. That way should we disagree with the

commissioners' proposed revenue side of the budget, and then we can make those recommendations in the best interest of the county going forward.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Can the chairs understand that 10% cut, ask ---

Mr. OHMAN: You can pick your own number. I just think if we can all get on the same page.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Yeah, right. If we are all on the same page. If one guy says 5%, another asks for 15%. Okay. Thank you, John. Yes, Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: Just file this under a newbie's question. I am not very clear what we do with that information. Maybe you can give me a little mini-FinCom primer. If we either approve the budget the commissioners send us or we don't. No? Can you enlighten us?

Mr. OHMAN: We would amend it and send it back to the commissioners as amended.

Ms. ANDREWS: That's what I'm asking, so that ---

Mr. OHMAN: We have that power and we have done that in the past. Actually we have more leeway to do that going forward than we had in years past.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, Spyro.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Mr. Speaker, if we decide that we have to send back the budget that is smaller than the one that was sent to us, we would have to make specific line recommendations so we would be taking into account what those department heads had offered as reductions, if we need to make reductions, as opposed to us just going by a general 5%, 10% rule. John's being proactive in asking the department head if you had to live with less what would it be, and we may choose as a group to take some cuts and not others. It would certainly behoove us just to have it available.

Again, I think the timing is awkward. We have a budget being presented before we have revenue figures being clear to us so they are going to dovetail to get at some point that come around the end of April, but here we are in March talking to department heads.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, Cheryl.

Ms. ANDREWS: I understood what he was saying. I can hear you. It's more I'm trying to get a little more clarity. And maybe we just don't want to say it. I want to get more clarity about what sort of -- what the idea was here. It seemed to me that a number of people had concerns about revenue for this year's budget, but it passed, and those concerns have come to pass. But the commissioners' position is that somehow they are going to make it all work and either find revenue or turn-backs or whatever items they are talking about and be able to stay within their spending budget.

I haven't heard the commissioners talk about making any cuts for this year. Quite the opposite. They came to us not long ago and talked about moving some reserves in. My question is what's going to be different about next year than this year. It seems to me next year's budget is probably very similar to this year's.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: As far as I can tell, it's a separate event. It's a separate revenue event, a separate expense event. Right now we're talking about constructing a budget for 2013. If you walk into it with a surplus or if you walk into it with a deficit from 2012, it's still a separate event.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, John.

Mr. OHMAN: So I'm not sure I am going to answer this properly. I think what the question really is whether or not the revenue stream is accurate for 2013. At least that's what I'm questioning listening to the commissioners and the department heads and Mark Zielinsky talk about what they project the revenues to be at the Registry of Deeds this year. They project

7.45 million on the deed side of the things. We are on target for 6.4 million. When I asked Mr. Zielinsky that question during the budget hearings, he said they expect far greater revenues in the second half to come up with a total of seven million, and based on that seven million revenue projection for the rest of 2012, they are now predicting seven million to come in for 2013. I am not convinced that number is accurate. I would like to know if the department heads and our committee chairs will at least ask the department heads should we disagree and feel the need to cut the 2013 budget that we want to cut it at the least painful method possible.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. PILCHER: I'd just like to speak in support of what John is requesting, because we did go have an experience three years ago or maybe it was two years ago, where the budget had to be cut. But what happened was the committees had already met, had recommended the budget and the cuts were essentially made by the finance committee without necessarily direct input from the committee chairs or the department heads. And if we are going to have to face that situation again, which seems to me a very good possibility, I would say it would be good to have those recommendations from department heads.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay, Paul. I apologize for drawing a blank on your name. Tom, go ahead.

Mr. LYNCH: I just echo what Paul just said, and that is that when the finance committee has its meetings with the committee chairs, if the committee chairs have had a discussion around how, you know, the budgets are reviewed or built, what programs were the most important, what a cut would mean to them, and we had that information as a group, talking. It just adds to the data that you'll have should you need to go to that route of trimming the budget in some way.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Anybody else? Okay. We'll put that to rest. The next order is the MMA Report. Delegate Spyro wanted this put on. So we'll let him take it away.

Discussion on the MMA Report

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Thanks. Let me just say, I want to kick off the discussion, not going to belabor the point. I think we've been looking at and talking about the MMA report for a while now, and it's really becoming relevant as we are getting closer to examining the budget that the commissioners will be giving us. It's a terrific instrument to have going into a new budget deliberation. My concern is though the commissioners aren't looking at it as part of this year's budget formulation. There are some terrific recommendations in it in reorganizing the administration.

I draw your attention to Pages 3 going into 4, if anybody has the report in front of them, in terms of the impact it would have on county government should we reorganize according to this plan. What I would really be hoping they would come to recognize in looking at this report is that it has also economic efficiencies in it. In other words, by reorganizing we could probably streamline some of our operations, make them more efficient. By that, I mean it would cost us less to operate the county.

More specifically, there's terrific recommendations about the county administrator's role which folds neatly into the discussion that the special commission on governance is having, not only just the county administrator but the assistant county administrator's role will be redefined possibly. They could be one in the same person as the budget director that this report is recommending. And it occurred to me that given the personalities involved, if you were to redefine the assistant county administrator, maybe make him the budget or the finance director,

you would be going a long way to addressing CLC/CVEC special committee's investigation into how those organizations operate. So there are twofers or three-fers, or whatever you want to call them here, but for me the primary motivation was to look at this document as a way to streamline and make the county more financially efficient.

Having said that, I haven't seen any evidence that the commissioners are using this in that manner during this budget. So I don't want this opportunity to pass without at least the assembly pointing to it and saying, hey, what about these recommendations.

Reorganization, they're suggesting, would take the two-year cycle anyways. But if we start along that process two years from now we could see the benefits of it. Specific recommendations around the county administrators, you can debate them. I can live without the recommendation like Cape Cod Commission coming underneath the county administrator as opposed to county commissioners.

Nevertheless, I think it's worth saying that you have a management report that would allow us to run county government more efficiently. We'd like you to send how to incorporate some of those recommendations into this budget, if that's at all possible, and to get to the punch line if you are in such agreement that that's a useful exercise on our part. I would like to come back two weeks from now with a resolution for this body to consider, that would ask the commissioners to do so.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: It's quiet as a church in here. Anything else? Are you all done, Spyro? I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: It's open for discussion. Again I was trying to make it as succinct as possible.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Any thoughts on that? Julia.

Ms. TAYLOR: Well, I guess we did bring this up with the commissioners in a previous meeting, and they replied that they wanted to hold off on these changes, or even deciding whether they wanted to adopt them or reject them until they had heard from this special commission. I'm sympathetic to your idea. On the other hand, I can see why given that they paid for this report, now they've got this commission. I can see why they might not have felt they could really combine the two when they don't have the second one in time for this budget, what they have to give us next week.

So I'm sympathetic to that problem, but that being said, I would be interested in their giving some discussion of that when they present the budget. I'd like to hear some thoughts when they present the budget as to what they might see as something that could be done even if it's not reflected right now in the 15th budget. Is this something that could be reflected? You don't have to wait a year to do it, and if you're right and some of it could save money, I'd like to have some concept of their time line that didn't have to wait until next year's budget.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: The chairman of the commission would like to have a few words, but we need someone to suspend the rules.

Ms. TAYLOR: I would suggest we suspend the rules.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Do we have a second?

Mr. OHMAN: Second.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: All in favor. Go ahead, Mary Pat.

Commissioner FLYNN: The commissioners have discussed this and as Julie said we really did want to wait until the special commission came out with this report, because if you are going to look at perhaps a reorganization in the big picture in terms of governance, you really don't necessarily want to get right into the meat of the more internal changes.

So we are very well aware of that, and we thought about that as the budget was prepared. We actually believe that any of the changes that we do want to move forward with the recommendations, some of them in that report, and we don't think that this budget would be an impediment to doing that.

Anything that we do with the MMA report, it will be a plan in transition. I mean, obviously it will have to be implemented over time. Some things could be done more easily than others. Some positions change more easily than others, and we are going to move forward with that this year. We are not going to wait. So we will develop a transition plan for implementing some of the recommendations in that MMA plan.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Thank you. Anything else? Go ahead, Deborah.

Ms. MCCUTCHEON: I haven't been to all of the meetings of the special commission. But my perception has been they are largely dealing with things that are currently kind of beyond the scope of the employees of the county, and the structure of the personnel is sort of beneath the commissioners. And I guess my question is, I mean, there are some real logical suggestions in that MMA report that it seems to me you might want to implement no matter what happens with the special commission or with — I mean, for example, the idea of reorganizing so you have a budget director and you have a strong chief executive. I think it matters not what the special commission does as to whether that makes sense. So maybe I didn't understand.

Commissioner FLYNN: Well, that's true. I mean, if we wanted to have the administrator who was solely an administrator, and have a finance director or budget director and split out the treasury, the financial functions from the county administrator that could be done without the report. But the other thing is the special commission has been considering other agencies or other groups outside of the county to bring into the county like mosquito control project, and possibly some others that they think might want to be folded into county government.

So certain, I think, at the top level, those changes could take place without having the report, but at the next level down, you really do need to have the report to know exactly how to reorganize internally.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: Mr. Speaker.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Go ahead, Spyro.

Mr. MITROKOSTAS: The effect of my suggestion was to get the commissioners to look at creating their budget in such a way that you can make the changes you would like to make before July of 2013. Unless it's incorporated in the commissioner's budget coming this July 1st, for example, bringing the county administrator completely back in to the commissioners' budget or bringing the assistant county administrator back into the commissioners' budget. You only have two positions in the commissioner's budget. Then it's going to have to wait a year to this exact point a year from now to make that adjustment in the budget recommendations. So the earliest you'd be able to implement it would be July of 2013.

So unless we get a budget that says we are fully funding our two personnel in this fashion, this isn't going to happen for 15 months.

Commissioner FLYNN: Well, there are other ways that we can do it.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Okay. Anything else?

Ms. KING: Move to adjourn.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: Is there a second?

Delegate: Second.

Deputy Speaker ANDERSON: All in favor say “aye”. Okay. We’re adjourned. Thank you.

Whereupon, it was moved, seconded and voted to adjourn the Assembly of Delegates at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O’Connell, Clerk
Assembly of Delegates