



**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, Nat Lowell

**MINUTES**

Thursday, June 25, 2019

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

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

Staff: Rebecca Woodley-Oliver, Assistant Procurement Officer; Alexandria Penta, Financial Analyst  
Attending Members: Welch, Kaizer, Hussey, Kickham, Bridges, Lowell  
Absent Members: McEachern  
Late arrival: Kaizer, 10:06 a.m.; Hussey, 10:12  
Documents used: Copy of minutes for June 6 & 13 and July 11 & 18, 2019; sample RORIs;  
Agenda adopted by unanimous consent.

**I. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

**II. APPROVE MINUTES**

1. June 6, 2019: **Motion to Approve** made by Bridges. Carried 3-0//Welch abstained
2. June 13, 2019: **Motion to Approve**. Made by Bridges. Carried 3-0//Welch abstained
3. July 11, 2019: **Motion to Approve** made by Bridges. Carried 3-0//Welch abstained
4. July 18, 2019: **Motion to Approve** made by Bridges. Carried 3-0//Welch abstained

**III. DISCUSSION OF RORI USE & DEFINITIONS**

Discussion Review of where they left at the last meeting: coming up with definitions for the subcategories.

**Welch** – These terms were taken from the Financial Policies and Procedures. The definition of Ops High P(priority) – Required is that it prevents degradation. Someone might rank something based upon it’s not prevent degradation.

**Kaizer** – Department Heads are going to argue something is needed to prevent degradation; it is incumbent upon us to sift through what they are saying to perceive what is integral to continue providing services.

**Kickham** – In the past, we’ve asked for the Department Heads to prioritize their requests; that gives us what they consider to be their main priorities. He listens to what they have to say.

**Welch** – Before moving on, he wants to ensure everyone is good with the definition of Ops High P – Required as preventing degradation.

**Consensus** – Yes.

**Lowell** – He would like to have a way of listing inventory items; feels those don’t require the level of discussion individual capital request get.

**Welch** – The only reason the replacement of SCBA air packs are capital requests is because one costs \$50,000 and meet the definition of a capital item. Continuity is a big portion of filling out the RORI.

**Bridges** – Asked about switching “preserves necessary function” to high and “prevents degradation” to medium.

**Consensus** – Agreed and explained reasoning.

**Lowell** – However, if Town Administration and Finance don't agree with the switch, their rankings would skew the numbers.

**Penta** – She will ensure Ms. Gibson and Mr. Turbitt are on board with the switch before making it on the RORI.

**Woodley-Oliver** – Finance's rankings have followed that logic to some degree already.

**Welch** – Asked if there are questions on Heritage-Tradition-Culture-Legacy.

**Lowell** – Explained how he views this subcategory: traditional use. Feels N/A should be a ranking.

**Woodley-Oliver** – Pointed out that 95% of requests don't fall into this category.

**Welch** – Explained how N/A would skew the valuation of all categories and requests. Putting in Zero is the way to address something not be applicable; gave examples. Asked for thoughts on a definition.

**Kickham** – Suggested historic relevance.

**Consensus** – Agreed that is a good definition and provided examples.

**Welch** – We're ranking projects based on each criterion; other issues will flavor one's rankings. Part of what isn't in here is cost as a function as well as debt service obligations; those are part of what we do.

**Bridges** – The RORI should be individual for each project relating to each box without any consideration about voters, master plans, out years, etc. Once we and Finance and Town Administration have ranked the projects, that's when we bring in the outside considerations.

**Lowell** – Agrees with Mr. Bridges; after we've ranked a project, we should have separate conversations that incorporates outside influencers.

**Welch** – There is a comments section on the RORI, so you can bring up questions at the meeting. When assigning values, cost shouldn't be part of the reasoning; that's a separate item and should be addressed at the meeting. Cost is a function of itself and should be discussed as such; if you think the cost is too high, make that note in the comments.

**Kickham** – He'd like to see a subcategory that addresses the idea that the cost for a request might be too high or too low.

**Welch** – Explained why he would prefer that be discussed in the group. Another part of cost is the "true cost": maintenance, insurance, resale, carrying charge, etc. The cost of a project is an individual category and, in the future, would be its own subcategory.

**Kaizer** – Explained why the cost of an item flavors his valuation under the Cost category.

**Welch** – That will be part of the RORI in the future; we aren't there yet.

**Lowell** – The RORI form should be specific to what we try to do. Debt service et al. should be part of a separate discussion.

**Welch** – If in assigning values a member thinks something is not applicable, the assigned value can be zero. Part of reviewing the RORI is leading into the revising the financial policies and procedures.

**Kickham** – Asked if separate subcategories for major or minor improvements to efficiency and effectiveness is necessary. Whether it is major or minor would be reflected in the score assigned.

**Lowell** – Suggested one subcategory for "improve efficiency & effectiveness."

**Welch** – He sees major and minor improvements as different; also, he feels that if minor is removed, we are sending the message that minor improvements have no purpose.

**Lowell** – Thinks we should leave both. Regarding subcategory Supports strategic plan(s), he thinks of the Town Strategic Plan, not departmental.

**Welch** – It is in the financial policies and procedures as, "supports strategic plan: master, open." We've talked about breaking this into subcategories. This is in here to incentivize departmental long-range planning and Town Administration supporting goals that matter to most of the community.

**Woodley-Oliver** – She doesn't think every department has a strategic plan; that's why it is difficult to rank projects. Finance looks exclusively at how a project fits into the Town Strategic Plan; perhaps that needs to be clarified.

**Hussey** – The Town's Strategic Plan addresses: transportation, parking, affordable housing, facilities...

**Bridges** – ...environmental leadership, landfill, water quality, housing in general, and facilities.

**Hussey** – He has trouble seeing how, for example, IT's requests would fit into the Town's Strategic Plan; he can see how it fits into IT's 10-year plan.

**Welch** – At the last meeting, we came to a definition of this subcategory based upon the purpose, incentivizing department heads to plan ahead so that projects are in the 10-year CIP request form. As a responsible public body, we should be doing debt forecasting over the 10-year plan. An example where that isn't happening is the Schools; he's heard that we need another \$50M school and hasn't seen it in our 10-year plan.

**Lowell** – It is in the School 10-year plan.

**Woodley-Oliver & Hussey** – Confirmed that it has been brought up and is in the School out-year planning.

**Welch** – In the next iteration of the RORI, Supports strategic plan(s) will get subcategories: Town Strategic Plan, department plan, master plan, open-space plans, CIP 10-year plan, exceptions, and housing production plans. The reason we want to be able to have these requests brought out years in advance is to identify the need and allow us to process the request more effectively. Our reviews would be about emergencies, exception, legal requirement, imminent threat. In the meantime, the ranking is about if a project fits a documented plan.

**Kickham** – We now have the Coastal Management Plan.

**Bridges** – He now understands the value for this subcategory.

**Lowell** – We have to know which plan the project is under.

**Welch** – There is a place for that on the CIP Request Form. Suggested, if the school is on the long-range plan, he will make an apology.

**Woodley-Oliver** – pulled up a copy of the School long-range plan showing the \$50M for another school.

**Welch** – If we can get past the semantics, this can be a useful valuation; suggested changing the language to read "Supports mid- to long-term plan(s)" to open up the meaning of this subcategory.

#### **IV. SCHEDULE NEW SOFTWARE DEMONSTRATION & TRAINING**

Thursday August 1, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. at the Wannacomet Water Company Conference Room.

#### **V. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

1. OIH:

Hussey – This was the first look at options and pricing. Came up with a plan to build a building without taking anything down: build part, move patients into the new building, demo current building, and finish the new building. Every room in the new building would temporarily be a double room until the old building is demolished; then they would make all the rooms single rooms. It would be all the way over by the dirt road and none is in the flood plain. The difference between Options 1 & 2 is square footage. There would be issues with parking. The most expensive is \$43M and the low option was \$41M. There would be savings in energy with the new building. It would be two stories with all the rooms on the second floor and support on the first floor.

Discussion about services that could be provided and create additional income.

#### **VI. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

1. Not at this time.

#### **VII. LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS**

1. Not at this time.

**VIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Green Sheet
2. Member Comments
  - a. None
3. Date of the next meeting
  - a. Thursday, August 1, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.

Adjourned at 11:37 p.m.

Submitted by:  
Terry L. Norton