Town of Nantucket
Capital Program Committee

www.nantucket-ma.gov

Members: Stephen Welch, (Chair) Peter Kaizer, (Vice Chair), Howard Matz, Jill Vieth (Secretary), Brooke Mohr, Christy Kickham, Barry Rector

MINUTES
Thursday, August 15, 2023

Called to order at 1:00 p.m. and audio/visual announcements made by Chair Welch.

Staff:	Brian Turbitt, Director of Municipal Finance, Susan Carmel, Assistant Finance Director
Attending Members:	Welch, Mohr, Matz, Rector, Kaizer, Kickham
Absent Members:	Vieth
Documents Used:	RORI Spreadsheet,

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	
Motion:	**Motion to Approve, as submitted. (made by: Rector) (seconded)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 6:0//Welch, Mohr, Matz, Rector, Kaizer, Kickham (Aye)

II. PUBLIC COMMENT
Welch called for public comment. (None)

III. IDENTIFY FORM MODIFICATIONS, PROVIDE CRITERIA DEFINITIONS, DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT ACTION PLAN	
Discussion:	**Welch** • Introduced the purpose of going through and establishing common definitions for the RORI (Ranking of Relative Importance). • Emphasized the importance of a common understanding of words and terms for efficient valuations at the next meeting. • Described the RORI worksheet as a distillation of Massachusetts Department of Revenue and town of Nantucket guidance. • Explained that priorities were programmatically grouped into pairwise comparisons for individual Capital requests. • Clarified that subjective values would be input by individual members during the next meeting for prioritization. • Emphasized that the valuations are subjective and serve as guidance and guardrails, providing a basis for comparing priorities. • Described the valuations as a tool to process information and understand the relative importance of requests. • Mentioned that the rankings help inform decisions, especially during the mid-December up-down ranking to broadcast recommendations to the Select Board and Finance Committee. • Outlined the process of quickly determining priorities above or below the average, streamlining further discussions on requests. • Noted that discussions will focus on requests close to the line or where members were uncertain in their valuations. • Provided an overview of the sheet and the overall process along with the criteria definitions, following Committee Members clarifications, questions and comments. **Committee** • Reviewed the breakdown of priorities into groups. • Grouped priorities based on two characteristics: compact continuity and resilience. **Welch** • Introduced phase two for the expansion.

	• Requested to include all the yellow items, particularly those related to Disaster Recovery, in the discussion. • Categorized priorities into groups, such as Compact Continuity and Resilience. • Mentioned that the categories align with the Department of Revenue compact, emphasizing the importance of risk. • Outlined the risk group, covering aspects like cost accuracy, deliverability, and management capacity oversight. • Acknowledged that the outlined categories may not be final and are meant to prompt thinking about the expansion capability for ranking. • Highlighted factors like funding, its impact on bond rating and tax rate, and different funding sources (borrowing, cash, grants, reappropriation). • Introduced the concept of benefit-cost analysis, considering whether the community is subsidizing or if it falls under an Enterprise account for the use-to-cost ratio. • Pointed out the negligible difference in spread between the 30 and a 50. • Stated the need to determine whether to use quarters or tenths for the evaluation. **Committee** • Suggested using quarters, where four is the best and zero is the worst for evaluation as guidance. • Provided flexibility for members to use tens if they prefer a more specific approach. • Encouraged members to express their evaluations in a manner that suits their preferences. • Explained the process of being presented with a collection of projects or proposals at each meeting. • Raised questions of whether to complete them during the meeting or wait until later. • Suggested allocating five to ten minutes in the meeting for the completion of RORI evaluations. • Emphasized the importance of completing evaluations in a timely manner to prevent them from becoming a burden. • Noted that ideally, evaluations should be done before the next meeting, especially after meeting with department heads.

IV. WORK GROUP DEVELOPMENT OF FISCAL YEAR (FY) CAPCOM REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Discussion:	
Motion:	
Roll-Call Vote:	

V. DATE OF NEXT MEETING
Regular Meeting: August 24, 2023, at 1:00pm

VI. ADJOURNMENT	
Motion:	**Motion to adjourn at 2:27pm. (made by: Kickham) (seconded)**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 6:0//Welch, Mohr, Matz, Rector, Kaizer, Kickham (Aye)

Submitted by:
Elaina Cano