



Town of Nantucket Capital Program Committee

www.nantucket-ma.gov

Members: Stephen Welch (Chair), Richard Hussey (Vice Chair), Jill Vieth (Secretary), Jason Bridges, Pete Kaizer, Christy Kickham, Barry Rector

MINUTES

Thursday, December 08, 2022

131 Pleasant Street & Zoom

Called to order at 10:05 am. and announcements made by Mr. Welch.

Staff: Brian Turbitt, Financial Director; Susan Carmel, Assistant Financial Director; Mariya Barsheva, Assistant Town Accountant; Terry Norton, Town Minutes Taker

Attending Members: Welch, Hussey, Vieth, Kaizer, Kickham, Rector

Absent Members: Bridges

Late arrival: Rector, 10:10 am

Department Heads: Patrick Reed, Transportation Planner; Art Gasbarro, Chair Airport Commission; Tom Rafter, Airport Manager

Documents used: Copy of draft minutes as listed; Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Requests; CapCom Ranking of relative Importance Worksheet.

Adoption of Agenda

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

Vote Carried unanimously

I. PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Norton – Apologized for outburst which interrupted last week’s meeting.
2. Bob Williams, Founder director Nantucket Pond Coalition – Thanked CapCom for \$4m for the Pond Coalition to restore and Island maintain ponds. The Federal grant made clear that 98% of nutrients are on the bottom and led to plan to dredge the ponds. Intend to sell both the sediment and sand from that dredging. If Phosphates are on bottom of pond, don’t need to bring it in. Testing indicates it’s safe with no heavy metals. Sand is being barged in when we could probably provide it from the bottom of the ponds.
Kickham – Asked the timeline for the actual process: a few weeks or months.
Williams – The Town issued a Request for Proposal (RFP); the design is for a large scale project that could take up to 1 year. The permitting could take up to 3 years.
Hussey – Asked for a review of the financial request and the grant.
Williams – The request was \$4m and the 1st grant \$30,000 to figure out where nutrients were coming from, the 2nd grant is \$300,000 for design. His vision is that the Town puts up half and the rest comes from other sources.
Welch – Asked if the numbers are consistent with his experience.
Williams – Yes.
Kickham – Asked if this is a positive or mild impact on the quality of the pond.
Williams – He thinks it’ll be a huge impact. You have meadows growing on the bottom of the ponds with algae in the pond itself, some of which can emit toxins. Depending on the design, I don’t know how much of the 42 acres will actually need to be dredged. A canal off the north of the pond was created in the 1980s and might be dredged as well.
Welch – This is a worthwhile project for that location and a pilot for other ponds and perhaps Head of Harbor; it might create a revenue and stop the sediment load from being recirculated. Suggested looking at the design and planning with an eye for scalability and reuse on other ponds.

II. APPROVE MINUTES

1. December 1, 2022

Motion No action at this time.

Vote N/A

III. OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF FY2024 CAPITAL REQUESTS

1. DPW Transportation-Wauwinet Road Multi-Use Path

Discussion a. Presentation of FY2024 and Out-Year Requests.

Reed – The Town applied for Federal Aid from the Land Access Program. The path has been in planning since the 1970s; now there are situations of high speed and drivers crossing the center line due to congestion. Today we're working with Fed Highway on a MOA to move the project forward; they would be owners of the project. The cost is subject to change; it's at \$4.85m but could go up due to resources and construction costs. Feds asking for initial phase from Polpis to Pocomo.

Kaizer – Asked if this request is for \$3m.

Carmel – Will phase in; we will do \$3m this year and balance next year; still in discussion with Mr. Turbitt on.

Reed – Right now we're anticipating phasing this project. We can move Phase II forward if resources allow; money from the \$3m would be there for that. Fed \$283,200 for design and \$1m for construction with 20% match from the Town. That is for Phase I.

Welch – Within the database, the explanation needs to be updated; there's a discrepancy in the grant monies.

Kickham – Asked if there are wetland abutment issues.

Reed – He anticipates there will be wetland impacts.

Welch – It would be helpful to include in the summary that this is phased, and the termination point at this time.

Rector – As with other grants, they seem to be time sensitive; asked if that's true here.

Reed – He doesn't have a confident answer; generally, that is the case. We were initially rewarded in 2016 and then 2018; there doesn't seem to be rush but it makes sense to move things forward.

Kickham – In the past, some paths have had private funding. There is a large benefactor at the end for the road who would benefit; asked if they've been addressed.

Reed – There is an advocacy group interested in moving this forward. We have received comments of concern from one citizen. We want to do our best to satisfy the neighbors.

Rector – There are a number of organizations which would benefit from this.

Welch – We will do a ranking of relative importance based on its merits.

2. Rankings Discussion

Discussion a. Presentation

Welch – Reviewed requests received to date. He reduced information to the number of requests, code, description, department head priority, legal requirement, dollar amount request, our recommended dollar amount, ranking of relative importance, comments, our funding recommendation as reflected in the database, existing comments, and footnotes. Total request before us is \$111.04m.

Discussion about how to move forward through the projects, run down the list.

Welch – The Sewer-25-001 Replacement F550 Utility Truck needs to be filled out by members. We need that data before it's discussed. The TRANS-20-003 Wauwinet Road multi-use path needs to be filled out. We have 11 items to be discussed. Suggested looking at the master site plan provided by the Airport.

NMA-23-001

Welch – We received the master site plan for the lot.

Gasbarro – Airport staff has been working with consultants to address committee concerns and questions. We're looking to take care of crew quarters to get seasonal folks into property accommodations. Plan to start in the southwest corner and work out from there. Will bring in infrastructure for the full buildout.

Vieth – With the fuller buildout, asked what all the buildings are.

Gasbarro – Those would be housing for Airport staff, and potential 1st responders. This is a long-range look into how the land might be utilized.

Vieth – Asked if they will be going to the Planning Board and Historic District Condition (HDC) with these even though they don't have to.

Gasbarro – This project would be completely locally funded. In terms of permitting and approvals, he's not sure of the plans.

Rafter – This is Airport funded, not taxpayer funded. We will go forward with permitting as for any regular development.

Welch – If you use federal funding, Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act comes into effect.

Vieth – Asked if there's any way to get a firm commitment that they will go to the Planning Board. She'd love to see more details about the structures. She's concerned about the double curb cut on Nobadeer Farm Road and might lead to it's having to be widened.

Gasbarro – We are sensitive to that point and hired Ethan Griffin, Gryphon Architects in hopes of meeting standards the community expects.

Welch – Ms. Vieth's concerns about the road is part of the long-term viability of this request.

Kickham – Asked if the FAA has indicated the level of development the Airport is allowed. He wants to ensure that approval will be relevant in 10 years. Regarding the existing proposal, asked if this is an as-needed basis; i.e. if this can solve housing issues, they will pursue further housing.

Rafter – FAA permit is for use of the land. If 1 to 3 buildings suffice to meet our needs, that will be it.

Kickham – It seems they've received special consideration for this housing. The FAA is on board with the build out.

Rafter – Our housing has to be specific to our needs. All the units would be for Airport employees with some being single-family dwellings and some duplexes.

Gasbarro – There would be no more development done than necessary to meet the Airport needs, because we have to pay for that.

Vieth – Asked if they can put commercial buildings in there with the housing.

Gasbarro – We've focused on a residential aspect for this property.

Rector – This is closer in terms of what we were looking for. This would all be paid for by the Airport from their Enterprise account with no supplements from the Town. He sees a cookie-cutter approach to site development, which is part of a preliminary process. It would help to see a document that talks about what is envisioned and phasing and what the FAA will or will not permit. We need to all understand what will come out of the process. There is much to be discussed before the shovel breaks the ground. Asked if a summary document will be produced.

Rafter – We are required to have a sustainable business; if housing weren't a crisis on Island, we wouldn't be doing this. The FAA recognized that crisis and permitted us to do this. We'd prefer to stay with our core business.

Welch – Clearly the Airport has a need as dire as the rest of the Island; you have land to utilize and the cost for housing is high. Asked if the FAA approval was for the initial lot, that is reflected in the master plan or for the entire lot.

Rafter – The approval was for 5 acres.

Welch – Conceivably, the FAA doesn't care where the housing goes. Asked if there's an expiration on the approval.

Rafter – Not that he's aware of.

Welch – He's looking at part of a plan but not the whole plan; it's not our purview to rule on the efficacy of the Master Plan but it's within our right to review how it fits into the whole. Without the Master Plan, we can't see the whole. His principal concern is the restriction on the use. Asked at what point would the Airport require the rest of the housing, 11 units.

Rafter – He doesn't see that happening. As you get up to senior-level candidates, you are recruiting nationally and need housing. The Thompson House might address part of that so one other residence might be needed here.

Welch – His concerns include: the restrictions on use, housing model with respect to ownership/tenancy, and how the concept fits into an effective Master Plan. The concept of an expiration for use comes into focus.

Rector – Asked how far out the resolution with what land is federally obligate (within 1 month). That's good; once that's done, it identifies what is the Airport. Asked the timeframe for when this is fully operational.

Rafter – Might start seeing construction in the Fall, more likely Spring 2024. Completion is based upon supply but perhaps 12 months after start, Summer 2025.

Rafter – That timeline is important in his book.

Kickham – He supports this request. He's not bothered by traffic issues; thinks the roadway can take the housing. The Airport has done its work.

Kaizer – Echoes some of those sentiments. It's crucial for businesses and entities to have their own employee housing. He doesn't want to hold up what is right for the Airport based upon the site plan.

Rector – He feels you have to look at it whenever you're engaging in a chunk of land, you need to look at highest and best use. He sees an opportunity that the road to the Delta Fields is either useless and needs to be abandoned or it's improved so that it's dealing with both the housing and the Delta Fields. Even though the Airport has rights to it, this is Town property.

Welch – We're veering off the point. Either we don't recommend it, or we do. We can include conditions in our recommendations. The concept is within our purview, but the granularity needs to go Planning.

b. Deliberation

Welch – Asked if we should look into recommendations with conditions.

Kickham – He understands the points about land use. The more we go into the other units, the more critical he will become.

Vieth – She could see making a motion where they get Planning Board approval of the plan for transparency. She's not opposed to the idea of employee housing.

Hussey – He was glad to see them come back with a revised plan. They are looking at something similar to the Miacomet Golf Course dormitory. They have no control over the cost. He's persuaded to pass this.

Kickham – He'd be amenable to recommending they meet with Planning to show them this site plan for the sake of Island planning. They came back with a much lower number.

Welch – Our recommendation would include a condition that there be details on what the request is for. This is about what's built reflects what we recommended.

Rector – He wants to see them move forward. We can request that the Planning Board do a site plan review. He's troubled by the fact that this is affordable housing, but his concern is the magnitude of this and the possibility of their coming back to us in the future; all the parts will work together.

Welch – It seems we're looking at a favorable recommendation. There's a question of conditions regarding Planning Board and HDC review.

Vieth – She'd support this if the Planning Board had reviewed this before they came to us. They could do this next year. She feels the public will have concerns about this.

Welch – A favorable recommendation conditioned upon successful Planning Board site plan review prior to Town Meeting, and they seek HDC site plan review.

Kickham – He'd add that, for any future work on that plot, there be a proper Master Plan of build-out for the remainder of the property. He's on board with their going to Planning; but it won't hold up his vote.

Discussion on the motion.

Motion **Motion to provide a favorable recommendation conditioned upon favorable Planning Board site plan review prior to Town Meeting and favorable HDC site plan review during the normal unfolding of the process.** (made by: Hussey) (seconded)

Vote Carried unanimously

3. Wannacomet Water Company Housing

Discussion **Welch** – The same metrics don't apply as for the Airport; it's a small tract of land and not on an overburdened road and will have little aesthetic impact. The cost is significantly less.

Kaizer – There is no restriction on users with this.

Welch – Municipal buildings are not exempt from any review.

Motion **Motion to provide a favorable recommendation.** (made by: Hussey) (seconded)

Vote Carried 5-0//Rector abstain

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Green Sheet/Committee Reports

a. None

2. Good of the Order

a. None

3. Date of the next meeting

a. Thursday, December 15, 2022 @ 10:00 am

4. Report-writing Workgroup Updates: Welch, Vieth, Hussey, Kickham

Discussions about request changes, content, schedule and document receipt, footnotes and appendices, presentation, further workgroup meetings, CapCom review, and submission to FinCom and Select Board.

5. Adjournment

Motion **Motion to Adjourn at 12:24 pm.** (made by: Hussey) (seconded)

Vote Carried unanimously

Submitted by:

Terry L. Norton