



## Town of Nantucket Capital Program Committee

[www.nantucket-ma.gov](http://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 27, 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 10:01 a.m. and announcements made by Mr. Welch

Staff: Brian Turbitt, Director Finance; Richard Sears, Assistant Director Finance; Alexandria Penta, Financial Analyst

Attending Members: Welch, Kaizer, Hussey, Kickham, McEachern, Ferrantella

Absent Members: Bridges

Late arrival: Kickham 10:15 a.m.

Documents used: Copy of minutes as listed below; 10-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP); Capital Project Status Report; CapCom 2020 Schedule

Motion to Adopt the agenda. (Kaizer)

Carried 5-0//Ferrantella, McEachern, Hussey, Kaizer, and Welch-aye

### I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

### II. FY2022 START DATE (UPDATE)

Discussion **Sears** – We are working to provide a tight, recommended list of capital projects for FY2022. First set to be on September 10<sup>th</sup>: Wannacomet Water Company (WWCO) and the Airport. Will schedule additional departments from September 17<sup>th</sup> on.

**Welch** – We budget about an hour: last year the Airport was pared with the Police Department and WWCO with Our Island Home. Asked if the two will fit into the one hour.

**Sears** – A good chunk are the FY2021 requests moving forward to FY2022.

### III. FINANCE COMMITTEE (FINCOM)/CAPCOM WORKGROUP SESSION

Discussion **Welch** – Me and Mr. Kaizer and Mr. McEachern met with the FinCom chair and vice chair. It was productive, and we shared optimism on clearing the air on lingering CapCom performance. FinCom agreed to alter their schedule by one week. Discussed scheduling initiatives and received no comments for modifications or dissent on those initiatives.

**McEachern** – Asked if Mr. Turbitt envisions prior to September 10<sup>th</sup> that there will be materials provided two days prior to that hearing.

**Turbitt** – Clearly the Wednesday before. The likelihood of the Airport bringing forward requests is remote; they will bring supplemental funding requests for the soil testing. Select Board declared an emergency, and we received authorization to spend up to \$2.5m. Town Manager has been clear, the expectation is that everything is there before the presentation. There will be better cooperation and more internal review by Finance; we won't be comfortable with advancing something for which we do not have all the information.

**Sears** – Both WWCO and the Airport know they information must be submitted no later than September 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Welch** – At this point it was made clear everyone is on board with getting us the information as early as possible. We would like to have the information no later than the Tuesday morning prior to a department’s review. It would be good practice for the department heads to have a set deadline well prior to the presentation. We don’t need a formal vote but he wants to make that clear.

**Ferrantella** – Asked if September 10<sup>th</sup> is doable and will that be enough time to get the CIP requests.

**Turbitt** – Town Manager’s email was clear; we are under a compressed timeline and it was clear the majority of requests are from prior years. Given the paring down of Airport capital projects to focus on large issues. Historically, WWCO has not had a large number of projects and have been consistent about identifying streets for water main work. He thinks these two departments can meet the September 10<sup>th</sup> deadline.

**Welch** – He would like to establish that we, based on member comments, are not going to review incomplete requests; ensured that is where we are headed. It’s a waste of time to review incomplete information.

**Kickham** – It’s not fair to the ones who do the work to review projects for which there is not all the information.

**Turbitt** – We instituted that during the kick-off week, we will review all General Fund projects and RORI them, so you can see the FY2022 list.

**Welch** – Unless there is further discussion, he would like to formalize the schedule with a vote, and that we will start September 10<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Pena made a good point in keeping September 3<sup>rd</sup> as a start date and noting it wasn’t used due to COVID-related matters; that way we can use this schedule as a template next year.

Motion

**Motion to Approve the use of the schedule.** (made by: Hussey) (seconded)

Roll-call Vote

Carried 6-0//Ferrantella, McEachern, Kaizer, Kickham, Hussey, and Welch-aye

#### **IV. RORI, CIP REQUEST FORM AND DATABASE TWEAKS (UPDATE)**

Discussion

**Welch** – We’re going to swap the descriptions of the highs and mediums at the top of the sheet in Category A. We’re going to change the language for Strategic Plan to mid- or long-term. We’re trying to map specific projects to the Strategic Plan; will add “Community” to the language, so it supports a community or strategic plan.

**Turbitt** – One change we put in was a drop down from which department heads to choose which plan the project supports. Adding “Community” shouldn’t be a problem.

**Welch** – We need to clarify scheduled replacements to build the idea of thinking in the long-term and to avoid items falling through the cracks; it would be helpful to add motor vehicles, roofs, and computers; it would also be helpful in terms of incentivizing long-term planning. Next was the Project Cost, the total cost of a project on the intro tab. We discussed adding a save/edit feature to the RORI.

**Turbitt** – A host of these change were in the packet we started a couple of months ago. The most important piece was how to get FY2021 projects into FY2022. A save/edit function was also discussed.

**Welch** – He presumes the RORI will be fully functional for September 10<sup>th</sup>.

**Turbitt** – It is in a staged site where we can monitor it. He has to get together with Ms. Ferrantella about how to use the software.

**Welch** – We also had adding descriptions that are more a narrative, completing CIP requests forms, and including supplemental documents; Mr. Turbitt has assured those are focus points being worked on. One discussion that came up in the workgroup was that we focus less on process and more on the review. Once we get Ms. Ferrantella on board, we can work out that process. Might hold a second workgroup on longer-term refinements.

**McEachern** – Something that was brought up was allowing FinCom access to the database.

**Welch** – He submitted that suggestion to Ms. Gibson but hasn't heard back. He would like to see that active for the middle of the month meeting; he feels it would be helpful for them to see that data when CapCom gets it.

**Turbitt** – It will be great but haven't started rolling it out; creating user names and passwords is a short process; the difficulty is tying them into the system without creating additional RORIs.

**Welch** – He has an idea for that by allowing them access into a report portal, so they can see the information but not have edit capability.

**Turbitt** – The solution can't have an unintentional consequence.

**McEachern** – We would also be able to see who on Select Board or FinCom viewed the information.

**Welch** – He had not thought about auditing capabilities; that is something that would be worthwhile.

## V. ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

### 1. 10-Year CIP

Discussion **Welch** – He's hoping to pull together a workgroup to look at longer-term initiatives, what's required, and bring them back to the Committee. He'd like the group to set a direction on what, how, and when we would like to see the 10-year CIP. The committee as a whole would set the policy. In the packet is the 10-year CIP list in spreadsheet form; we've been supporting moving that into a working document by suggesting department heads submit any reasonable request on the horizon; it's not fully qualitative or quantitative but gives CapCom an idea of what to expect. Suggested we consider that any projects within 3 years have a high level of detail; as we go out further, the level of detail drops off so at 10 years out we know it's out there.

**Kaizer** – Right now it looks more like a 5-year plan; The tradeoff between 5 years and 10 years is accuracy. Being a working document, he doesn't want to see too much review effort going into every project out to 5 years; a level of general information would behoove us rather than details.

**Kickham** – We could quiz department heads on how they think about 5 years and 10 years out so we can look and track this and start them thinking about it; we could also identify who has more projects out there.

**McEachern** – In his job, he does a 5-year capital project which is extensive in details; 5 to 10 years is more verbal than numbers.

**Welch** – This is for reserve fund planning. There are going to be some infrastructure elements that lend themselves to this type of planning: sewer, water, CMOM. It will help to flesh out details on big-ticket projects. It will be a cultural switch for department heads to start thinking about the long term.

**Turbitt** – A lot of what's being discussed, we've discussed internally. We have to pay attention to FY2022 to FY2027. We've asked department heads to focus on the next 5 years but to also look out 10 years. There's been a lot of emphasis on the fact we need a better handle on what is in the short term and the larger cost projects in the 5- to 10-year range. You might not have all the documentation for plans within 5 years, but you'll have an understanding and where the cost is coming from. 6-10 years are very hard to project unless they are big-dollar projects.

**Kickham** – Asked the reasonability to have finances 5 to 10 years out; those could significantly change.

**Turbitt** – As we work to rebuild the forecast, the importance is on large-cost projects that would be borrowed and help us shore up the financial forecasting and how to fit them in.

**Welch** – Once we add in the current total costs of projects for the current and next two out years, the next area of policies and procedures we haven't gotten to planning for capacity; i.e. where costs might be smoothed out. Another helpful thing will be the utility of having the CMOM and WWCO and sewer working out the average cost per foot and including that in a comment line. That can be updated as we draw closer; our job is to ensure it is collated.

**Kickham** – Suggested Finance target two weeks a year in which a department focuses on 5 to 10 years out.

**Turbitt** – He’s open to any revision, tweaks, changes that create a better report and how we get better information in a timely manner.

**Welch** – Asked that be put into an action later in the calendar: homing in on development of CIP 10-year requests and concept of narrowing down for department heads to do that, or if there is a better way for Finance and Town Administration to do it. Asked to add review of 10-year CIP process to the October 15<sup>th</sup> agenda.

**McEachern** – It would be great for Mr. Sears, Mr. Turbitt and Ms. Gibson to put a dollar amount on that.

**Sears** – Putting the onus on CapCom, he agrees developing the 10-year is important. However, we need to give guidance to department heads on dollar thresholds.

**Welch** – Asked if there are thoughts on the threshold amount and guidance on that. He thinks anything over \$1m would qualify as something he would like to see.

**Kickham** – He doesn’t want to deter department heads from doing long-term planning because they don’t have projects that meet the threshold; he would lean much lower.

**Welch** – One way we could refine is to ask for anything but only items about certain dollar amounts based upon current costs.

**Ferrantella** – She agrees with Mr. Kickham. We want as much information as possible.

**Hussey** – We know many of the major costs; it seems like new buildings will be the major projects. Maybe the threshold is \$5m.

**McEachern** – He thinks that threshold should come from Mr. Turbitt; if he needs to fund funding from the outside, he needs to know sooner, rather than later. The point about buildings is excellent.

**Turbitt** – Agrees the 1<sup>st</sup> step is an internal discussion.

**Welch** – Hopes the Facilities Master Plan will provide some form to what to expect regarding new buildings. Regardless of the threshold number, he agrees with the more we have the better but agrees Mr. Turbitt needs to decide the level of details needed on specific requests; some projects won’t need a high level of detail.

**Ferrantella** – Select Board is meeting in October about the Strategic Plan and will have more information on the Facilities Master Plan.

**Welch** – He will put in recommendations from Finance on the 10-year CIP process, Deliverables, thresholds, etc. for October 15<sup>th</sup>.

## VI. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Green Sheet/Committee Reports
  - a. Nothing for Green Sheets: Welch explained these allow representatives to departments to have comments from CapCom for meetings with the department heads.
2. Good of the Order
  - a. Nothing
3. Date of the next meeting
  - a. Thursday, September 3, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

## VII. APPROVE MINUTES

1. December 19, 2019
2. January 9, 21, & 23, 2020

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

Roll-call Vote Carried 4-0// McEachern, Kickham, Kaizer, Hussey-aye; Ferrantella and Welch abstain

3. August 13 & 20, 2020

Motion **Motion to Hold.** (made by: Kaizer) (seconded)

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

Adjournment

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 11:04 a.m.** (made by: Hussey) (seconded)

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

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton