



**Wellfleet Board of Selectmen &  
Wellfleet Finance Committee Joint Meeting  
Minutes of the Meeting of December 29, 2009  
Wellfleet Senior Center, 7:00 p.m.**

**Present:** Chairman Dale Donovan, Michael May, Jacqueline Wildes-Beebe and Ira Wood; Town Administrator Paul Sieloff; Finance Committee members Dennis Murphy, Robert Kelly, Elizabeth Sorrell, John Morrissey, Janet Loewenstein, Robert Wallace, and Donna Roberston.

**Not Present:** Jerry Houk, Sylvia Smith and Sam Bradford.

Chairman Dale Donovan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**Announcements, Open Session and Public Comment**

Donovan announced that an H1N1 Flu Clinic would be held on January 6, 2010 from 4:00 to 7:00pm at the Wellfleet COA.

**Public Hearing(s) [7:00]**

**Community Preservation Committee – Annual Needs Assessment**

Community Preservation Committee requesting review of annual list of community needs for Housing, Historic Preservation, Open Space and Recreation, gathered by the Wellfleet Community Preservation Committee in accordance with the Community Preservation Act, M.G.L. c. 44B.

Peter Hall from the Community Preservation Committee presented the boards with a list of needs as identified in 2009. Hall explained that the list is not an exhaustive list, nor does it exclude new items from being added. The list is intended to serve as guidance for making decisions. Hall said that the CPC is looking for comments on the items on the list and ideas for those that might be added. He also explained that the CPC does not initiate any applications for CPA funding; rather, they evaluate the applications that come in and determine if they should be on the ATM Warrant. The Town Meeting grants the approval of funds.

Hall added that he would like to publicly thank Mary Rogers for all that she does for the CPC as Committee Secretary.

Kelly asked about the expectation for state matching funds this year. Hall explained that SB90 is currently making its way through the legislature. The CPC has planned for 35% matching funds, but it could be as much as 50%, or as little as 0%.

Hall pointed out a new need that was identified – to preserve the archives of Town Hall, which includes old ledgers and records going back to the beginning of the Town.

Sorrell asked how decisions are made to fund projects. Hall explained that each request that is approved gets some money, but it may be less than the amount requested. If it is approved, a project is at least partially funded. The program requires 10% open space, 10% historic, and 10% community housing. Up to 70% can be for recreation, but could be under 10%, as there is no minimum for recreation.

Hall explained that a private citizen could submit an application. Applications do not have to originate with a Town organization. The project applied for should help Wellfleet.

Hall noted that the CPC is getting roughly \$300K from the Town, but what it will receive from the state is unknown. It received \$186K for 2010 and is estimating very little for the upcoming year to be safe.

Donovan and the board thanked Hall for his report.

### **Capital Improvement Plan**

A public hearing with the Wellfleet Finance Committee on the proposed Capital Improvement Plan for FY2011.

It was noted that the number of new projects for this year is very limited.

The FinCom proposed a Vehicle Rollover Policy and Form, and explained that it is not recommending any new vehicle purchase without a Vehicle Rollover Form. The Department Heads have been told of this change by the FinCom. The FinCom also recommends that the police cruiser purchase be removed from the Police Department's Operating Budget and put into the Capital Budget, as that is where all other vehicle purchases for the other departments are placed.

Sieloff explained that the Capital Budget is for substantial capital purchases which require borrowing. It is Sieloff's view that the Department Heads are comfortable with putting the police cruiser in the Operating Budget, and he believes that this is actually a positive thing, budget-wise.

Sieloff suggested a compromise position – to create a new, distinct line in the ATM Warrant for "Vehicles."

Wood noted that the Shellfish Department had a truck request in the Capital Budget, and asked what the difference is for Sieloff between this vehicle purchase and the police cruiser.

Sorrell noted that if vehicle purchases are in the Operating Budget for some departments and in the Capital Budget for others, then those in the Operating Budget improperly inflates the Operating Budgets of those departments. In years where there are no vehicle purchases in the Operating Budget for a department, it skews the view of that department's expenses/budget. Sorrell feels that there needs to be consistency across departments on this issue.

Loewenstein noted that the Police Department budget includes the cost of a police cruiser every year, so there is no fluctuation in that Operating Budget.

Town Accountant Marilyn Crary asked whether the Police Department bought a new vehicle every year, or every other year. She thought it was every other year.

Kelly noted that the Police Department is replacing each police cruiser every 4 years, so that this fell below the 5-year useful life requirement for capital purchases. He added

that the \$5,000/5-year useful life requirement for capital purchases was changed to \$5,000/1-year useful life, so by this standard, wouldn't the police cruiser fall back into the Capital Budget?

Sieloff admitted that the capital purchases requirement is a "work in progress." He added that his position on the police cruiser is actually an unusual one for a Town Administrator to advocate, as normally they like to keep the Operating Budget low and put larger items in the Capital Budget.

Sieloff explained that the \$6,000 request for a Shellfish Department truck is actually a net cost for trading in a vehicle. He explained that Shellfish Constable Andy Koch has come up with a trade-in plan for his department which involves trading in vehicles earlier and taking advantage of the government discounts to make sure that the department always has good vehicles, as rust from salt is a big issue with these vehicles. They tend to deteriorate quicker than other department vehicles.

Murphy asked what the benefits are, if any, to the taxpayer if the police cruiser is included in the Operating Budget. He noted that if the voters want to pull the vehicle out, then they have to change the whole Warrant Article.

Sieloff said that he is proposing a limited number of vehicles and that he is willing to give deference to the vetting process with the Board of Selectmen and the FinCom.

Beebe explained that the Moderator goes page-by-page at the ATM and it would be the same process unless there is a separate Article for borrowing.

Donovan noted that vehicle purchases have historically been lightning rods, as they are often viewed as extravagant or unnecessary by the voters. Donovan said they are larger expenses that are disproportionately focused on.

Wallace asked what the rationale is for having 4 vehicles at the Police Department. He said that it was always adequate before with 2 vehicles, so why do they need 4 now?

Sieloff speculated about what may have happened in the past, and explained that each police cruiser's mileage is approximately 150K miles per year. The process that the Police Department is using to replace each vehicle after 4 years – or 1 every year – is thought to be better than sporadically replacing 2 vehicles in a single year. Sieloff added that the Police Department tries to minimize the cost of the new vehicles by reusing things that are in good condition and can be transferred from the old ones to the new ones.

Donovan explained he believes that the need for 4 vehicles is essentially based on scenarios such as a summer accident situation – if there is an accident on Rt. 6, there needs to be a vehicle at each end of the accident scene, and another to be available for patrolling at the same time. It has been determined that at least 3 vehicles are needed to adequately handle such a situation at peak population.

Wood suggested inviting the Police Chief to explain the rationale at either a FinCom or a Board of Selectmen's meeting, rather than speculating on the reasons without him.

Loewenstein noted that the FinCom has already invited the Police Chief to their January 20, 2010 meeting.

Sorrell reiterated that clarity and transparency is very important with regard to the budget. The sort of consistency that she and the FinCom are asking for is needed for the voters who attend the ATM and might not be as familiar with budgets or the details involved with creating them.

Kelly noted that the Recreation Department's capital items, such as the infield of the ball field, etc. appear to be under the DPW budget.

Sieloff explained that these items are in the DPW budget because the DPW manages these projects.

Kelly said that by having them in the DPW budget, even though they are doing the work, the true cost of the Recreation Department is not presented. These items should be charged back to the Recreation budget to show what it actually costs the Town to run the Recreation Department each year.

Beebe added that the DPW is paying a lot of the bigger bills for the Town, which makes the various department budgets look trimmer than they really are. This is good for the Department Heads, but not so good for the DPW. These bills include heating, cleaning, etc. and probably should be charged back to all of the departments so the true costs of each can be known.

Wood added, for the sake of consistency, that the paving at Maguire's Landing should be charged to the Beach Department, rather than the DPW.

Morrissey asked if it was a big deal to do this.

Sieloff said it was a big deal. The Accounting Department has only 1 person in addition to the Town Accountant. While this is a good and well-intentioned idea, there are real limitations to running small towns with limited staff.

Crary added that when the figures change 10% or more in either direction, then the Town must explain this change to the DOR. If we were to move these large items from the DPW budget to the various other budgets, this would certainly increase all of their budgets – and decrease the DPW budget – by more than 10%. An explanation would have to be provided to the DOR in each case, which requires a lot of paperwork. Crary would like some time to think about this a bit. She also asked whether it was in the Charter or someplace else that the DPW was required to provide these services.

Morrissey handed out a list of questions he prepared on the Capital Budget and CIP, along with 2 of the recommendations made by the DOR in their Marina Enterprise Fund Review from July 2009. A brief discussion ensued concerning these questions.

Murphy said that the FinCom has decided that it is going to ask for a reasonable estimate for the debt service on all borrowing. This is not going to be in the Article itself, but the FinCom is going to take the time at the ATM to explain the true cost over time of items requiring borrowing.

Murphy also said that the FinCom had reserved time in January to go over some budgets and capital requests of departments.

Kelly asked if the budget was still projected to be a balanced one.

Sieloff said it was. The budget he submitted in early December used projections for the schools, but he is expecting the budget to be balanced without a need for an override.

Loewenstein and Sorrell reported that they were in the process of preparing an amendment to the Charter for the ATM to remove all dates for the budget process because no one can meet those deadlines as they currently exist.

**MOTION 09-0322:** Wood moved to adjourn the meeting.

May seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Susan Cox, Executive Assistant