



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, Kristie Ferrantella

MINUTES

Thursday, August 20, 2020

*This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube,
Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Regarding Open Meeting Law*

Called to order at 11:00 a.m. and announcements made by Mr. Welch

Staff: Brian Turbitt, Director Finance; Alexandria Penta, Financial Analyst
Attending Members: Welch, Kaizer, Hussey, Kickham
Absent Members: McEachern, Bridges
Late Arrival: Ferrantella, 11:48 a.m. (left early)
Documents used: Copy of minutes for December 19, 2019, January 9, 21, 23, & 29, 2020, April 4, 2020, and August 13, 2020; 2020 Annual Town Meeting (ATM) Capital Appropriations Excel printout; Worksheet: Capital Project Requests – Ranks of Relative Importance (RORI) to CIP prioritization criteria; Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Request Form; Draft CapCom meeting schedule – FY2021 Requests.

Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

II. 2020 ANNUAL TOWN MEETING CAPITAL APPROPRIATIONS Q&A

Discussion **Hussey** – Doesn't see the school boiler replacement.
Turbitt – That was removed; it's being alternately funded. It remains in the CIP software; it was not approved at the ATM. If the members want it put back in, he will do that.
Welch – Would like it tracked along with last year's and this year's school requests; he wants to be comfortable with how we are tracking it; an alpha-numeric code would be consistent with other projects from other years.
Kickham – Asked how it was decided which capital projects would be removed.
Turbitt – Explained the decision process for removing items from the 2020 capital projects by funding source: free cash, raise and appropriate.
Kaizer – Ground water Airport Investigation, asked if that is related to PFAS.
Turbitt – Yes, originally it was \$250,000 and prior to ATM it became clear a cost increase was necessary and it was raised to \$500,000.
Kaizer – Asked if there is a summary of projects still in process and will it be made available to members.
Turbitt – Yes. Mr. Sears has been going through the list with Dept Heads to consolidate the list.
Welch – We will deal with that at the Sept 21 meeting. We'll discuss that more during schedule.
Hussey – Asked how we will deal with the "not approved" projects in FY2022.
Welch – We will pick that up in the schedule.

III. ORGANIZATIONAL WORK SESSION

1. RORI

- Discussion **Welch** – There’s an ongoing list of refinements and working in other aspects of what we’re supposed to be reviewing in policy and procedures; the upshot will impact total funding. Those will be handled more in depth with the overhaul of the RORI.
- Lighter issues include: there would be less focus on process and more on group; swapping description of “Ops High” and “Ops Med.”; add a project box field at the top when a project came up which we were filling out. Recommend we ask those be addressed prior to taking up the RORIs.
- Kaizer** – Asked if there have been any clarifications regarding “Continuity B”; that seemed to be where we had the most discussion.
- Welch** – “Heritage-Tradition-Culture-Legacy” is a broad description where we have our own interpretations. Those words denote an intent. A deviation by members on that area doesn’t skew the whole. “Scheduled Replacement” could be broken into sub-category for future renditions of the RORI; at least that is what is in his notes. If we have a workgroup that pulls this aside for structural recommendations, we could go through this and make any changes we want. It will remain as is for this year.
- Further discussion about possible sub-categories of criteria under Continuity B.
- Kickham** – Asked if any of criteria under “Resilience” might always get the same answers and if any might be a given what the answer will be.
- Welch** – Most projects which “Support strategic plan(s)” are included to help differentiate projects that aren’t part of the Town’s long-term plan. “Infrastructure improvement(s)” is similar. “Alleviate overstressed-burdened” is also similar; it comes out of a concept that as a municipality providing services which are lacking or be expanded. Personally, re-voting this at a late point, Resilience might take an overall higher score.
- Kickham** – Where it says cost, asked if there is a line item Finance might add for CapCom to consider from Finance’s point of view.
- Turbitt** – He’s comfortable with what we have chosen.
- Kaizer** – Kristie Ferrantella will have to go through the process as the rest of us to generate her RORI priorities; if he recalls, that will impact the group’s priorities.
- Welch** – No, he thinks that at this point, opening that up will be something we don’t have time to address. Subject to anticipating going forward, we can pick this up. Ms. Ferrantella will be using the frameworks that have been established; he sent her an email stating he will walk her through this.

2. CIP Request Form

- Discussion **Welch** – These are working well; the issues is getting them in a timely manner; our draft schedule puts the receipt date as September 3rd. From prior discussion with Finance, he will want verification on direct support on timely and complete submission. The department heads need to submit the CIP Request Form, along with required supporting documentation, in a timely manner, so Finance can review them and forward them to Committee members before we need them. Maybe many requests will be from last year and we’ve already reviewed them.
- Kaizer** – Asked if these are being filled out electronically or transposed.
- Welch** – They were designed to be done on line to eliminate redundancy.
- Turbitt** – These forms are completely on line; we are no longer using paper copies.
- Kaizer** – The descriptions were lacking; one thing he recalls is digging deep to find things that should be plain or obvious such a description of what the application was for. Our wish list was to have a summary, so we wouldn’t have to ask questions.
- Welch** – That is on the list along with what we’ve indicated to be picked up on the RORIs. Note for now is description be better presented. Asked if that is an action item to be taken up with the RORI changes.

Turbitt – Sure, we’ve undertaken and in the process of developing a website where these changes are implemented. Noted the changes come out of his operating budget along with everything else; to the extent possible, he can include them, but we’ve expended a significant amount of money to make substantial changes and he needs to figure out how to deal with all the projects that CapCom approved and regenerate RORIs for those.

Welch – He thinks those will be easy because it’s click drag and click into the new form. One structural aspect would be the opportunity to print out the CIP request form as it was originally designed.

Turbitt – That change is in development now.

Kickham – Asked if an adjustment was being made on the project description. He liked having a short narrative from the department head about what the project and its scope. They used to tell us that; now they click a box.

Kaizer – Agrees with Mr. Kickham. It is a waste of time to ask the dept head that every time when we could have it ahead of time.

Welch – Agrees, the narrative in advance allows us time to formulate questions and have the time to ask those questions.

Turbitt – Mr. Sears is working with departments on what projects are and for the descriptions to be more descriptive; we are already working on that internally.

3. Schedule: Reports, FY2022 Procedure, etc.

Discussion

Welch – This is the first year we’re doing a conglomeration schedule of the CapCom, Finance Committee (FinCom), and Select Board schedules as well as other parties to fill the ATM timeline. Funding sources that track how articles are presented at ATM being an important part of our policy and procedures. Our reports are coming in later than when it was a simple list of positive and negative numbers indicating recommendations. The idea is we answer questions in advance, so everyone can move on with their own reviews; however, there are some concerns and “cultural” and perceptive and factual concerns. We are taking a pro-active role in scheduling to help FinCom review project requests early and often. We don’t have the resources from Finance to put together early and frequent reports; it’s a matter of working out how and when that access will be available.

Reviewed the CapCom FY2021 schedule as it relates to those of other boards and committees.

Kaizer – Regarding liaison assignments, it was helpful to go to the department location; in light of the restrictive nature of visiting people, it might be harder to get the benefit of liaison meeting.

Welch – We will start meeting with department heads September 3rd. We need to have that department’s CIP requests prior to the meeting with that department.

Kickham – We only have about 6 days to meet with departments before we start meeting with them in groups.

Welch – Some of the scheduled entries are for the integrity of the schedule when we pick it up next year. Due to COVID, the idea is to defer liaison assignments for next year earlier in the process. Asked if it will be possible to get a department in for review on Sept 3rd.

Turbitt – It depends on the department and what they have – larger departments such as DPW and transportation-impossible; more practical for IT and other smaller departments.

Welch – He’s hoping that the idea doesn’t matter how big the department is but that their requests are complete.

Penta – There is an argument for having the larger departments to go earlier in the process due to the back and forth and asking for more information. She understands why putting them later, but it is usually a battle to get additional information.

Kickham – If no one is doing the process prior to the meeting, the question is why are meeting. He prefers to review the department that has done its part. Last year we ended up looking at half-finished items.

Turbitt – Mr. Sears role is to be the interface with the department and help them provide the necessary information. There are checkmarks about information to be filled out before the form can be saved; however, he will check it anyway to ensure the provided information is sufficient.

Kickham – Even though we say old requests, there is also a change in the project estimates requiring further oversight.

Welch – Starting the process earlier becomes more an annual procedure so others can have our report earlier. With respect to supplemental information, it is backing up the request and how it fits into the larger request, so we are comfortable with our recommendation. Last year he suggested those items be submitted to Finance before the request is accepted by Finance: a request can be submitted without that information, but Finance doesn't have to accept it until they get the information. Asked if there will be a department to be reviewed on September 3rd.

Turbitt – He has to talk to Libby Gibson about that. He will report back whether or not we can deliver on that.

Welch – That sets the stage for the rest of the schedule discussion. Keeping the report presentation due date Wednesday, January 27, 2021. We need to keep that date, so will have to make accommodations to ensure that. He doesn't want CapCom to be held to one standard while other Boards and Committees are not. He wants to ensure the sentiment he expressed is shared by the committee.

Our goal is to help FinCom meet their requirement for due diligence; the way to do that is to provide them log-on access to the CIP Request Forms the same as we do.

Asked Members to consider thoughts about changing the hours for the meetings; that will be broached next week.

He found it useful to monitor early feedback from the Select Board; the suggestion here is that FinCom will receive the same report. Everyone will have the big picture in October. This also allows us to understand what other people's concerns are and address those.

Kaizer – It would be wide to limit the scope, so it doesn't get too granular into requests upon which we haven't received information or departments we haven't reviewed.

Welch – The idea is to avoid that; there is kind of an enmity involved in our reporting. We wouldn't provide the report, it would be the same information Town Administration provides to the Select Board.

Kickham – Asked if this is for Select Board and FinCom to ask us questions and/or to pare down the final report.

Welch – No; currently once a month, Ms. Gibson or Mr. Turbitt presents a report titled FY21 Capital Projects. That report would also be supplied to FinCom; they then have the opportunity to ask broader questions of Town Administration. Also, they have the opportunity to direct questions to us regarding specific requests. None of this is intended to reduce our report. That is all subject to Ms. Gibson.

October 15th could be a make-up date if we can't start September 3rd. On November 12th, he wasn't sure if we got into the meat of Select Board/Town Administration sponsored requests.

Turbitt – Any Town Admin requests would be filled out in advance; Select Board sponsored requests we put in as soon as we knew about it. He doesn't recall dedicating a specific meeting to those.

Welch – It would be helpful to target a date for review of those. At that point, we are running out of regular meetings. He will change the description to "Mop Up" for any requests that don't fall into a department. November 19th is a date to resolve any lingering open items.

November 20th is a new opportunity for Select Board/FinCom Q&A for FY2022 capital projects. We want to provide information and provide answers to any questions on our process; it isn't our place to represent or defend a specific request. Asked if there are any thoughts on this; it is a solution we are offering up regarding the 10-year CIP. He will bring up processes during meetings for further discussion. There is a perception we are not doing our due diligence and not helping them to do their due diligence; he wants to be sure he's articulating our intent.

CapProCom Minutes for August 20, 2020, adopted Sept. 17

December 3rd is set aside to review and discuss citizen articles regarding funding sources; it will also be an opportunity to recap to date, resolve open items, and do a preliminary review of the RORIs.

December 10th will be another opportunity to resolve lingering departmental requests and/or recap RORIs. It is the date he will start compiling the information for report to FinCom.

Provided a quick review of December 3rd and 10th for Mr. Kickham, who had to leave the meeting for a short time.

Discussion about the process of choosing which citizen articles CapCom might review for a funding source.

December 11th is a new concept: provide preliminary ups/down recommendation list to Town Administration for the Select Board and FinCom. It is to allow them to ask questions.

Kickham – Any updates are helpful, but they intrude on the continuity of our process. We might have done a lot of work, but things could change in joint meetings that makes our work a waste of time. He likes our report to be fully ours; though it is good to know if a project was taken off the shelf.

Hussey – Questions if we need the joint meeting on December 11th; he thinks providing the info is a good way to go. Our independence and process are thus preserved.

Welch – This close to our report, this type of back and forth taints our process. The December 11th entry would eliminate a time and becomes an “honored by” date where we provide updated information to the Select Board and FinCom; we already do that for Town Administration. Suggested keeping in everything except “respective CapCom rep available for Q&A ups/downs.” It would be for Town Administration use and distributed to Select Board at the same time.

December 17th, 21st, and January 4th would be recap days to resolve open items.

January 7th would be when we start finalizing our recommendation report and finalize Finance support.

January 14th would be when we receive final funding source information and resolve those. We’d also discuss and finalize our draft. The report would be presented to the SB on January 27th.

We’re trying to gap the information bridge with FinCom and eliminate the perception we aren’t working with FinCom. To that end, on Monday, August 24th he will meet with the FinCom Chair and Vice Chair along with their CapCom representative, Mr. McEachern.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Green Sheet/Committee Reports

a. None

2. Good of the Order

a. None

3. Date of the next meeting

a. August 27, 2020, 10:00 a.m.: data base and organizational matters.

Welch – Asked if 10:00 a.m. is working for everyone. For him, earlier would be better but 9:30 would be earliest. Mr. McEachern would also prefer to meet a little earlier. However, we already have the 10:00 a.m. time block reserved.

V. APPROVE MINUTES

1. December 19, 2019

2. January 9, 21, 23, & 29, 2020

3. August 13, 2020

Motion Continued

Roll-call Vote N/A

4. April 4, 2020

Motion **Motion to Approve.** (made by: Hussey) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0//Kickham, Kaizer, Hussey, and Welch-aye

Adjournment

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 1:06 p.m.** (made by: Kaizer) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote Carried //Kickham, Hussey, Kaizer, and Welch-aye

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton