



**Town of Nantucket
Capital Program Committee**
www.nantucket-ma.gov

Members: Stephen Welch (Chair), Pete Kaizer (vice chair), Richard Hussey (Secretary), Christy Kickham, Peter McEachern, Jason Bridges, Nat Lowell

MINUTES

Tuesday, January 21, 2020

1 Milestone Road, Wannacomet Water Company, Conference – 10:00 am

Called to order at 10:05 a.m. and Announcements made.

Staff: Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker
Attending Members: Welch, Kaizer, Hussey, Bridges, Lowell
Absent Members: Kickham, McEachern
Early Departure: Bridges, 12:02 p.m.
Documents used: Capital Improvement Plan (CIP); CIP Rank of Relative Importance Form (RORI); Capital Program Committee FY21 Report and Recommendations

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

II. APPROVE MINUTES

1. None

III. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, MODIFICATION OF DRAFT REPORT

Discussion **Welch** – He hopes that next year the report can be generated from the database.
Bridges – The report is good and nice to have. His concern is if Mr. Welch leaves the committee, how it is set up for the following CapCom chairs.
Welch – That’s where the concept of maturing the CIP request form and interfacing the database all comes in.
Bridges – Suggested Mr. Welch meet with Finance Committee (FinCom) Chair Denice Kronau and Select Board in April and May to discuss the report format and contents going forward.
Welch – Believes a joint meeting at the beginning of the budget cycle would be more helpful than at the end. Feels the joint meeting including FinCom should be issued after the report, not before. Stated that a joint meeting with FinCom and Select Board with the department heads present would also be helpful.
Bridges – Since she’s a new FinCom chair, suggested Mr. Welch meet with Ms. Kronau to review the report, especially the first 6 pages.
Welch – Talked about the need to change FinCom’s perception of CapCom’s charge.
Lowell – It’s important to have more than one FinCom member at a meeting who can understand how in depth CapCom gets during its review period. That would help if department heads’ presentations to FinCom aren’t the same as those made to CapCom.
Welch – During the perception shift, we need to be aware we can talk about those things within our purview so other boards and committees understand what CapCom does. If we are trying to do outreach on Capital, this Committees first needs to talk about the politics behind CIP requests; that’s why he turned down an interview with NPR.
Bridges – Suggested Mr. Welch should go on NPR and talk about the process and elements within CapCom’s charter, present a narrative on what the committee does.

Kaizer – It seems there is a disconnect in that FinCom doesn't know what to expect from CapCom; there is a lack of clarity about that. A discussion with the FinCom chair would be an opportunity to learn exactly what they expect from CapCom.

Welch – Feels a FinCom member should be able to review the report and use it to formulate their questions on projects for department heads with more depth and breadth to decide if additional review is required. CapCom isn't asking FinCom to "rubberstamp" the report; it isn't appropriate for CapCom to speak on behalf of the Town Manager, Finance Director, and department heads. We are giving FinCom a complete package and it seems they want to dig in more; previously they got a paucity of information and seemed okay with that. Suggested it might help if FinCom met with the Town department heads after CapCom has issued its report; it seems to him it would be a more productive of their use of time.

REVIEW OF FY21 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Welch – Summarized the narrative portion of the report and noted needed editorial corrections.

Hussey – Asked if staff reviewed the report to ensure the funding sources as stated are accurate.

Welch – The staff has no input or review of the report. Explained how he includes those into the report.

Lowell – Appendix A Transportation 17-002, noted there should be a reference to "in addition to Chapter 90 received from the State."

Welch – He will confirm with Mr. Turbitt if Chapter 90 funds are involved then include that. Asked about the Sewer Commission's implementation of the tiered-rate structure with establishment of sewer rates in the interim. Asked also if it is posted on the Town website.

Bridges – Yes; the tiered rate hasn't been ratified. We have raised rates until July 1 when hopefully the tiered-rate program will go into effect. There is probably something on the website.

Welch – He'll ask Mr. Turbitt if there is a link to that he can include in the report. We don't include retired debt service in this report and should; if it's linkable or manageable he can reference it in the report.

Discussion about whether or not to include retired debt service in this report.

Welch – Asked if a link to CapCom policy and procedures should be included in this report under Statement of Procedures.

Consensus – Supports including that link.

Welch – Our charge is to recommend projects based upon reasonably accurate information; he feels that needs to be stated in this report because that's where the end-of-January timeline comes in. Explained he didn't include prior year appropriations in the body of the report because accurate numbers only go back to 2017; it will be an appendix.

Bridges – On Page 10 of 12, the last sentence is very long and ends with "and" then picks up again at the top of Page 11 of 12. It is an important statement that should be included. Page 12 of 12, he has problems with the "charge" of Review and Development of Voter Feedback.

Welch – When reviewing a larger-ticket project, he feels the committee needs to have an understanding if there is general support from the public for that project. We have a lot of big-ticket items coming up in the next 10 years and if there is a very low chance for voter support at the ballot, it helps to decide about recommending the expenditure. His concern is recommending appropriations for the design and study on a project that would never pass on Town Meeting floor or the ballot.

Bridges – He doesn't believe CapCom should look through the lens of voter support when reviewing the merits of a project.

Hussey – He feels CapCom can't review the merits of a project if we don't know what it's going to cost.

Lowell – To the get point where we have a plan by which to ascertain the construction building costs, costs more today than it was to build that structure in the past.

Welch – He feels there needs to be a broader discussion on high-dollar requests if the community supports the request before spending the money to get the information needed to ascertain whether or not to proceed.

Bridges – The first sentence of that paragraph doesn't clearly state that. Perhaps his hang-up is use of the word "voter" rather than using stakeholder or constituent.

Lowell – Asked if under the Lover's Lane upgrade there should be mention of the huge puddle, which you can't drive through after heavy rain because it's so deep.

Hussy – On page A4, noted a correction.

Kaizer – Suggested that use of decimal places be consistently two places.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Date of the next meeting:

Thursday, January 23, 2020, 10:00 a.m. at 1 Milestone Road, Wannacomet Water Company, Conference Room

Vote to accept the FY21 Report and Recommendations

Adjourned at 12:07 p.m. by unanimous consent.

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton