

# West Tisbury Finance Committee

MINUTES 3-26-21

~Approved April 16, 2021~

A regular meeting of the West Tisbury Finance Committee was scheduled for March 26, 2020, 9:00 AM.

The meeting was audio and video recorded. Attendees participated by video conference, in accordance with Chapter 53 of the Acts of 2020. Members of the public were able to access the meeting using the instructions included in the Meeting Agenda. The public was encouraged to follow along using the posted agenda. Deviations from the agenda, if any, were noted.

The Meeting was called to order at 9:03 AM

*PRESENT:* Greg Orcutt (Chair); Clark Rattet, John Christensen, Doug Ruskin, Doug Finn.

*Also present:* Bruce Stone, Skipper Manter

## Approval of Minutes from the meeting of March 11th and March 18<sup>th</sup>

After polling the board, the chair deferred review of outstanding minutes to a later meeting.

## New Business

### *Complete Recommendations of Warrant Articles for the 2022 Town Meeting*

Mr. Stone noted two adjusted line items in the county budget - which is included in the overall municipal Budget warrant article. Mr. Stone explained that the county budget is tied to release of state cherry sheets, which are usually released later in the budget season (March or April of any given year). The differences in two line items are about \$700 for social services, and \$4,000 for Vineyard Health Care Access program. No warrant articles are affected.

### *Warrant Article Review:*

The Finance Committee proceeded to review and act on the below listed warrant articles. The Motion and Second are noted. All votes were by roll-call. The final vote is as recorded.

- Article 21: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Ruskin; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 22: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Ruskin; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 23: Motion to recommend was made by Ruskin; Second by Rattet; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 24: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Ruskin; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 25: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Ruskin; VOTED: 5, 0, 0

Mr. Finn noted that he had been following an older version of the warrant with out-of-date warrant article numbers, and MOVED to reconsider Article 24; SECONDED by Ruskin; VOTED: 5, 0, 0

- Article 24: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Ruskin; VOTED: 4, 0, 1 (Finn).
- Article 25: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Ruskin; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 26: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Ruskin; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 27: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0

- Article 28: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 29: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 30: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 31: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 32: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 33: Motion to recommend was made by Ruskin; Second by Rattet; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 34: Motion to recommend was made by Finn; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 35: Motion to recommend was made by Christensen; Second by Ruskin: 4, 1, 0 (Finn)
- Article 36: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 37: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Finn; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 38: Motion to recommend was made by Ruskin; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 39: Motion to recommend was made by Finn; Second by Rattet; VOTED: 4, 0, 1 (Ruskin)
- Article 40: Motion to recommend was made by Christensen; Second by Rattet; VOTED: 4, 0, 1 (Ruskin)
- Article 41: Motion to recommend was made by Christensen; Second by Rattet; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 42: Motion to recommend was made by Christensen; Second by Rattet; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 43: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 44: Motion to recommend was made by Finn; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 45: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 46: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 47: Motion to recommend was made by Rattet; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0
- Article 48: Motion to recommend was made by Ruskin; Second by Christensen; VOTED: 5, 0, 0

Mr Orcutt reminded the members that no action had yet been taken Article 12; further, that Article 8 had been recommended by a 3/0/2 vote; finally, that no action had yet been taken on Article 2 (main budget article).

Mr. Ruskin also noted that the school budget was only preliminarily considered, and had not yet been acted upon.

Mr. Orcutt suggested taking up Article 2 at a future meeting. The board generally concurred.

Mr. Ruskin asked if the committee would reconsider the Sheriff's Department budget request at a later meeting. After brief deliberation, the request was endorsed by all members.

## **Old Business / General Discussion**

Mr. Orcutt polled the members as to whether or not an Op Ed piece should be submitted by the Committee prior to the May 15 Town Meeting. After discussion, the board agreed to do so, and to aim for a publication date of May 6 or 7.

Mr. Orcutt polled the board as to whether handouts should be prepared for distribution at Town Meeting? There was some discussion, but no conclusive decision as to whether or not handouts should be prepared. The board will take up the matter at a later meeting.

There was some discussion relative to the content of the Op Ed and an potential handout:

Ruskin: No harm in a handout, but not much to say this year.

Rattet: Handout might help provide some transparency.

Christensen: With complicated numbers, it makes sense to reinforce those numbers with a paper guide at Town Meeting.

Finn: handout and OpEd should be taking the '40,000 foot view'.

Ruskin: A theme for OpEd? Orcutt: not at the moment.

Mr. Ruskin Suggested that topic of county dispatch equipment costs be included in narrative (an example of budget creep).

There was some discussion related to OPEB costs and etc.

There were no substantive Committee Reports.

Future meetings were tentatively scheduled for April 13, 3 PM and April 16, 9 AM.

Mr. Orcutt distributed a guidance document drafted by a former member of the FinComm.

Mr. Orcutt reminded members of the public that agendas and the "Zoom Link" is always available through the Town's Website.

## **Adjourn**

There being no further business, it was MOVED by Ruskin, SECONDED by

*To Adjourn.*

VOTED: 5, 0, 0. (10:11 AM)

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Finn,  
Clerk Pro Temp.