Town of Nantucket
Capital Program Committee
October 12, 2023, Minutes

Staff:	Libby Gibson, Town Manager, Rick Sears, Assistant Town Manager, Greg Tivnan, Assistant Town Manager, Brian Turbitt, Director of Municipal Finance, Susan Carmel, Assistant Finance Director
Attending Members:	Stephen Welch - *Chair*, Peter (PJ) Kaizer, *Vice Chair*, Christy Kickham – *Secretary,* Howard Matz, Brooke Mohr – Select Board Representative, Jill Vieth, Finance Committee Representative, Barry Rector, NP&EDC Representative,
Absent Members:	-
Documents Used:	Capital Improvement Plan FY 24 thru FY 33

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

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion:	**Motion to Approve, as submitted.**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 7:0//Welch, Kickham, Kaizer, Matz, Mohr, Rector, Vieth (Aye)

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Welch called for public comment. (None)

III. FY25 CAPITAL REQUESTS AND OUT-YEAR DISCUSSION: TOWN ADMINISTRATION – TOWN-WIDE DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Discussion:

Greg Tivnan, Assistant Town Manager, provided an overview and responded to questions.

- Provided on the list for FY24 was a request for $500,000 to continue the townwide document management system.
- Engaged in this effort before COVID, the town has been working to convert all documents to electronic form, starting with Public Health and Natural Resources.
- Migrated documents from these departments have already been completed, and the next focus will be the Store Department.
- Planned for the next phase is the conversion of PLUS department documents, although formal engagement with the necessary services has not yet occurred.
- Visited by Iron Mountain a few weeks ago, the town expected to receive a quote for the project, but it has not been received yet.
- Proposed is an onsite conversion of PLUS documents to ensure they do not leave the island or building.
- Noted was the fact that some funding, approximately $750,000, remains from previous years.
- Requested now is an additional $500,000 to initiate the process, with further needs to be evaluated for FY26.

Welch

- Proposed that PJ take over as chair for the remainder of the meeting to facilitate a smoother process since he was not present in the room.

Tivnan

- Engaged on this project since 2017, using general and image data through two vendors for services.

	- Utilized actual cost data to scan material into the Laserfiche archival system. - Prepared for the next significant project involving PLUS documents, with industry leader Iron Mountain providing an estimate. - Intended to use Iron Mountain based on past experience but aim to keep the project on-island, unlike previous instances. - Estimated a rough cost of around $2 million, awaiting a precise quote. - Requested $500,000 to start the project, with about $1.5 to $1.6 million remaining from previous authorizations. - Anticipated further details on the final cost, awaiting Iron Mountain's complete estimate. - Acknowledged the uniqueness and volume of the documents involved. - Expected to work on a couple of smaller departments before starting PLUS, such as Town Administration, HR, and Finance, scanning documents that are legally permissible. **Welch** - Acknowledged that the scanning services vary significantly across different departments, particularly in PLUS. - Noted that the project is somewhat fluid until a quote is provided, with quotes not front-end loaded beyond the current fiscal year request. - Observed that costs change rapidly due to inflation, reflecting on how this approach has been handled in the past. **Tivnan** - Acknowledged that the Town Clerk's office is several years ahead in their document scanning efforts, using the same services as other departments. - Noted that this overlap caused some issues with invoicing, but both have been using the same state contract with SHI, Data Image, and General Code. - Clarified that while the Town Clerk is responsible for e-filing, the broader project aims to make everything remotely accessible via PDF, not necessarily integrated into the InterGov system. - Confirmed that funds have been allocated since about 2017 for scanning and archiving across all Town departments, except for the Town Clerk, schools, airport, and water company. - Explained that the project began with Public Health, chosen because their documents were more standardized, making it easier to test the process. After successful results, the focus moved to Natural Resources, where archiving and scanning are ongoing. - Highlighted that work on the Sewer Department is nearly complete, with plans to address smaller departments next. - Clarified that the current funding is a continuation of previous allocations for this ongoing project, ultimately leading up to the larger, more complex PLUS department. - Outlined that each department will be responsible for maintaining the scanning and archiving process, similar to how Public Health and Natural Resources currently operate. - Planned to equip departments with optical scanners, allowing them to archive and scan documents as they are received daily. - Clarified that once the initial project is completed, each department will manage their own scanning and archiving process. - Noted that if additional equipment is needed, it would require separate capital requests. - Specified that ongoing oversight will be provided by Mike Alvarez in IT, who will continue to oversee the Laserfiche software and the overall archival system.

IV. SPECIAL TOWN MEETING REQUEST – SEASONAL EMPLOYEE HOUSING (SUPPLEMENTAL HOUSING)	
Discussion:	**Libby Gibson, Town Manager, provided a brief overview of the item** - Noted that this project, which has been in the works for some time, was initially intended to provide seasonal housing at Wait Drive. - Modeled after the dormitory-style housing of the Nantucket Yacht Club, the project secured an appropriation of $8.5 million at the 2023 Annual Town Meeting. - Clarified that the original intent was to house lifeguards, and while that remains the primary goal, discussions with the architect led to the idea of including a couple of year-round apartments. - Envisioned these apartments serving as transitional housing for employees, temporary accommodations for consultants, or a place for commuting or remote employees. Additionally, one apartment might be designated for a year-round employee acting as a caretaker. - Planned primarily to house lifeguards and other seasonal employees, with a total potential of 72 beds. - Included an alternate bid for an additional building that could add more beds, possibly up to 72. - Intended to repurpose existing seasonal staff housing and rented seasonal housing from the Mariah Mitchell Association. - Anticipated that the new housing would eliminate the need for the rented properties, allowing those to be repurposed for other uses. - Reiterated that the core purpose of this project is to provide stable housing for seasonal employees. **John Lemieux, Vertex** - Summarized that the total project budget currently stands at $11.7 million, with a 7.5% contingency included. - Comprised of a bid in hand from J&J Contractors, a modular builder responsible for both construction and the balance of the design. - Noted that $180,000 has already been contracted to Winslow, the schematic design and site designer who completed the site plan reviewed by bidders. - Explained that the Owner's Project Manager (OPM) charges include costs from October this year through April next year, with full-time oversight from April through October or November. - Outlined the Furniture, Fixture, and Equipment (FF&E) budget, based on recent estimates, including standard setups for 72 rooms, delivery premiums, and allowances for IT and data connections, utility back charges, appliances, and third-party testing required by code. - Concluded that the total project cost is $11.7 million, of which $8.5 million has already been appropriated, leaving a funding gap of $3.2 million. **Brian Turbitt, Director of Municipal Finance Top of Form** - Confirmed that the funding gap, as mentioned by John, is $3,204,000. - Proposed to cover this gap by transferring $1 million from the general fund budget, originally appropriated for employee housing assistance in April 2022, as that program was never established. - Suggested using Article 9 of the Special Town Meeting to authorize this transfer. - Proposed that the remaining $2.24 million be funded through a borrowing authorization under Article 12 of the same meeting. - Indicated that there is potential for 72 beds under the proposed construction format in that singular building.

	Lemieux - Clarified that it's not 72 bedrooms but dormitory-style housing with doubles and triples, except for the apartments. - Acknowledged that the town has flexibility to reduce the number of beds if needed, which could be a better sell to residents. - Noted that 72 beds represent the high end of the occupancy count. **Gibson** - Estimated that this project would likely cover almost 100% of the Town's seasonal employee housing needs, outside of the Community Service Officers (CSOs). - Noted that the housing would accommodate lifeguards, DPW seasonal workers, Natural Resources and Public Health seasonal staff, occasional interns, and other departments. - Mentioned that there could potentially be some overflow capacity for CSOs as well. **Mohr** - Highlighted that an important element of this project is freeing up other properties for housing needs within the municipality. - Emphasized that some of these other structures are better suited for single-family living, which is crucial given the significant housing challenges faced by the town. - Mentioned that during the recent police chief search, advertising the position with housing increased applicants from 10 to 40, underscoring the extent of the housing issue. - Supported the project as a necessary initiative to address the housing problem, recommending swift action before costs rise further. **Rector** - Acknowledged the potential for coordinating with other significant housing stakeholders like the airport and the school, as these entities, along with the Town, represent the largest sources of housing requests. - Recognized that some recent requests for single dwellings or duplexes have come in around $3 million, making this project, by comparison, more cost-effective. - Suggested that public sentiment might favor a more unified approach, questioning why separate entities are paying for different types of housing solutions. - Supported the current project while also emphasizing the importance of considering future coordination among these major players to optimize resources and address broader housing needs more effectively. **Lemieux** - Outlined that, if the project is approved at the upcoming town meeting, the design-builder would immediately proceed with completing the remaining design work and obtaining necessary approvals through town processes. - Planned to break ground in April, with initial production work focusing on the foundation. - Expected the modular units ("boxes") to arrive on site by mid to late summer. - Anticipated project completion by October, with everything finalized and turned over to the town, making the housing ready for use by the summer of 2025, but not for the summer of 2024. **Mohr** - Agreed that it's a compelling idea for the Select Board to engage in coordinated discussions about sharing housing assets among different entities, especially with Massachusetts having a new Housing Secretariat. - Recognized that housing seasonal employees in dorms is significantly cheaper than in single-family dwellings, and while seasonal workers might tolerate dorm living for a few months, permanent staff, like a DPW director, would not. - Acknowledged that the town's housing needs vary across family types, income levels, and roles within the community, making collaboration across the system a valuable approach.

	Welch - Acknowledged the importance of procedurally moving forward, noting that a vote on a recommendation will be needed next week to have any meaningful impact on the Special Town Meeting. - Recognized that while the master plan discussion among primary parties is beneficial, the level of detail that plan can achieve will be a topic of its own, likely outside the committee's purview. However, supporting the overall concept, even if it's just periodic discussions to evaluate what works, is considered valuable. - Highlighted the challenges of limited money and land, emphasizing the need to balance these factors against any coordinated efforts. - Focused on the financial aspects of the current project, noting that with an $11.7 million budget and assumptions of a 30-year useful life and 80% occupancy, the cost breaks down to about $580 per person per month, excluding carrying costs. - Expressed interest in understanding the funding mechanism, considering that higher occupancy would improve financial efficiency. - Reiterated the benefit of the project in freeing up family-style housing for employees at different levels, which is crucial given the skyrocketing housing costs. - Emphasized that the town is obligated to provide services, which require employees, and in turn, employees require housing. - Concluded by seeking feedback on the funding source, recognizing it as the only outstanding item to review before making a recommendation next week. **Turbitt** - Confirmed that there is currently an $8.5 million debt exclusion in place for the project. - Highlighted that the supplemental funding includes a $1 million request in Article 9 of the Special Town Meeting to transfer funds from a previously authorized but unutilized employee rental assistance program to this project. - Clarified that after this transfer, a gap of $2.24 million remains, which is addressed by a request for borrowing authorization under Article 12 of the Special Town Meeting. - Explained that the long-term cost will primarily involve the $2.24 million not covered by the $1 million transfer, on top of the existing $8.5 million debt exclusion. - Noted that the debt exclusion term will be determined when the borrowing is finalized, with the amortization typically set between 15 and 20 years to align with the town's financial policies regarding debt load. **Welch** - Agreed to defer the vote until next week, ensuring that the process aligns with standard practices.

V.	**FY25 CAPITAL REQUESTS AND OUT-YEAR DISCUSSION: TOWN ADMINISTRATION – COASTAL RESILENCY PLANNING**
Discussion:	**Libby Gibson, Town Manager, provided a brief overview of the item** - Explained that the $1 million request for fiscal year 2025 is intended to fund coastal resiliency projects that the Select Board might pursue, often based on recommendations from the Coastal Resiliency Advisory Committee. - Clarified that the funds would be available for various needs, such as matching grants, engaging consultants to prepare grants, or addressing specific coastal resiliency issues as they arise. - Provided examples of how similar appropriations from previous years have been used, including addressing issues with the Baxter Road erosion control project and applying for a grant related to the downtown flood barrier project.

- Emphasized that coastal resiliency is a high priority for the board, and this request is aimed at ensuring there are sufficient funds available to address consulting or engineering needs as they come up.
- Confirmed that the full $1 million hasn't been spent each year so far.
- Acknowledged that there could be a situation in the future where a significant amount, like $1.5 million, might be needed for a specific project.

Kickham

- Recognized the value of understanding how previous years' funds have been spent and what they were earmarked for, noting that it would be beneficial for the entire committee to have that information.
- Acknowledged that while the intent was to maintain a financial cushion for coastal resiliency, it's anticipated that this cushion may diminish over time given the increasing costs associated with addressing coastal resiliency needs.
- Inquired whether Libby feels comfortable with the current process of allocating funds to coastal resiliency without specific requests, acknowledging that this approach provides flexibility but also recognizing that the initiative is still in its early stages and staff are actively engaged in the effort.

Gibson

- Agreed that having flexibility in the allocation of funds is beneficial at this stage.
- Anticipated that as the coastal resiliency efforts progress, the focus will shift towards more specific projects, some of which are already planned for the out years of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Mohr

- Clarified that the $417,000 grant recently secured by Leah for the coastal resilience project, specifically for the flood barrier, might require the town to have matching or allocated funds in hand to qualify for the grant.
- Highlighted that having pre-approved funding available, like the annual $1 million allocation, is crucial as it allows the town to quickly access resources necessary to secure and match such grants.
- Emphasized that this flexibility helps the town leverage external funding opportunities effectively.

VI. FY25 CAPITAL REQUESTS AND OUT-YEAR DISCUSSION: TOWN ADMINISTRATION – EV CHARGING STATIONS

Discussion:

Greg Tivnan, Assistant Town Manager, provided an overview and responded to questions.

- Submitted this request on behalf of Lauren Sinatra from the Energy Office, as it aligns with the Select Board's Green Communities program.
- Reminded that the Select Board adopted the Green Communities program, which requires a certain number of charging stations over the years.
- Requested funding for four new charging stations with eight ports, specifying that these are Level 2 chargers, not Level 3, due to the high costs and the significant infrastructure improvements needed for electricity.
- Identified potential locations for these charging stations, including downtown, the town lot, and some non-public use areas, particularly to support the growing number of town electric vehicles. Currently, only one dedicated charging station exists for town vehicles, located at C Street.
- Mentioned that alongside this request, Lauren Sinatra has successfully applied for a rebate for four additional charging stations planned for local beaches, such as Surfside and Jetties.

- Acknowledged that this is an ongoing project, with the town working toward meeting greenhouse gas emissions and carbon restrictions by 2035 as part of the Green Communities criteria.
- Clarified that if the rebate for the charging stations at Jetties and Surfside Beach is secured, the funds approved at the May town meeting wouldn't need to be used for those locations.
- Acknowledged that those funds could then potentially be redirected to other charging station projects, like the downtown stations, reducing or possibly eliminating the need for new allocations in FY25.
- Noted the urgency of installing the rebate-covered chargers by January 26th, 2024, which is driving a quick timeline for ordering materials and starting installation.
- Mentioned that even with this potential reallocation, additional funding might still be necessary to meet the town's overall goals, particularly as Level 3 chargers are very expensive, costing around $60,000 to $75,000 each to order, install, and upgrade the electricity.
- Mentioned that the Select Board has recently adopted a new EV charging policy.
- Anticipated that by the end of October or early November, the policy will establish rates and time limits for EV charging.
- Clarified that this change means downtown charging will no longer be free, which should encourage turnover at charging stations, although vehicles may not be fully charged when they leave if they start at zero.

Welch

- Recalled that during the last round of discussions, the initial request was for Level 1 chargers, but they were upgraded to Level 2, as clarified by Lauren at the Town Meeting.
- Regarding the cost structure, Greg clarified that the new EV charging policy set up by the Select Board is completely separate from any state rebate or revenue collection program tied to EV license plates.

Tivnan

- Clarified that the Select Board has established a policy to recoup energy expenses for the charging stations, which are currently free to use.
- Explained that while the Select Board's policy is focused on recovering costs through charging fees, the initial installation of the charging stations was partially funded by the state. This state support may have been tied to a program like the license plate fund, which covered the cost of installation and electricity for the first two years.
- Noted that this state funding has since expired, and the town has been covering the costs.

Mohr

- Clarified that there was indeed a program that covered the electricity costs for the EV charging stations for a period, but that has now ended.
- Explained that the town has instituted a policy to recoup the electricity costs, including an administrative fee to cover billing and other associated costs.
- Additionally, parking restrictions and fines have been implemented to prevent extended use of the charging stations, often referred to as "hogging." If a vehicle remains at a station beyond a certain number of hours, the cost increases from about $2 per hour to $5 per hour.
- Stated there are also fines for non-EV vehicles parked in EV charging spots.

Kickham

- Raised a valid concern about whether decisions on costs are being made with a broader perspective, particularly regarding the potential benefits of more efficient Level 3 chargers.
- Acknowledged that while Level 3 chargers are more expensive, they could offer advantages in terms of efficiency, quicker charging times, and better management of costs and usage.

	Tivnan - Acknowledged that the initial focus was on being cost-efficient with the funding requests, but recognized that it might be worth considering a larger investment to support Level 3 chargers. - Suggested that allocating more funds and starting on the necessary electrical infrastructure now could position the town to install Level 3 chargers within the next two years, offering long-term benefits in efficiency and management. - **Welch** - Outlined a two-phase approach for addressing the potential deployment of Level 3 chargers: - **Request Additional Information:** Proposed that the committee request additional information on the pros and cons of Level 3 chargers compared to Level 2, considering factors such as deployment issues, costs, availability, and how they fit within the state rebate framework. This could involve having Lauren Sinatra from the Energy Office provide insights, either in person or through Town Administration. - **Review and Recommendation:** Suggested that after reviewing this information, the committee can decide whether to recommend targeted Level 3 deployment. If it turns out that Level 3 chargers are not feasible due to factors like backorders or high costs, the committee could still encourage planning for future deployment while making an informed decision on the current funding request. **Tivnan** - Supported the idea of hearing directly from Lauren Sinatra, acknowledging her expertise in the matter. **Welch** - Suggested obtaining a written list of the pros and cons of Level 2 versus Level 3 chargers, along with a brief introductory paragraph that provides context. - Proposed that this information be used to inform a potential discussion, ensuring that any further conversations are productive and time-efficient. - If the provided information is sufficient, the committee may not need to take additional time beyond discussing how it applies to the current funding request. If more details are required, the discussion can then be elevated with a deeper, more informed conversation.

VII.	FY25 CAPITAL REQUESTS AND OUT-YEAR DISCUSSION: TOWN ADMINISTRATION – POTENTIAL MA DEP PFAS REQUIREMENT
Discussion:	**Greg Tivnan, Assistant Town Manager, provided an overview and responded to questions.** - Explained that the Town has been actively analyzing, studying, and working to prevent sources of PFAS contamination across the island, with approximately $13 million allocated for various projects and studies. - Noted that last Thursday, the Town's landfill became the first in Massachusetts to be tested for PFAS in groundwater and surface water. This testing is part of an effort initiated with a SW22 form submission in December 2021. - Highlighted that the Massachusetts DEP was initially reluctant to allow the testing, as the findings could set a precedent for the entire state. However, after extensive discussions, they agreed, and the first round of testing has now been completed, with two more rounds to follow. - Acknowledged the uncertainty surrounding the potential findings and the need to be prepared for any required actions, including remediation, if PFAS is detected. The funds requested are intended as a contingency to ensure the Town can respond quickly if necessary.

	- Explained that the amount requested was estimated based on the cost per sampling and the expenses associated with the Town's PFAS consultant, CDM Smith, given the lack of precedent for this type of testing in Massachusetts. - Clarified that around $9 million is allocated for a water main project beginning west of the airport at the end of this month. - Noted that the project is partially funded by an $8.3 million SRF loan, with the remaining funds allocated at last year's Town Meeting and approved by ballot. - Mentioned that additional funds have been used for studies, sampling, protocol handling, and other related activities to address PFAS concerns across the island. **Welch** - Acknowledged the concern about the potential for PFAS issues arising in other areas of the town's functions, beyond the airport and landfill. - Recognized that if PFAS contamination is found in other operations, such as Sewer or other municipal facilities, it might be prudent to consider a slight expansion of the funding request to ensure that the Town is prepared. - Suggested that increasing the funding amount by a reasonable figure, such as $150,000, could be beneficial. This would allow the necessary funds to be reviewed and authorized at Town Meeting, providing flexibility to address any new PFAS-related issues that may arise without needing to seek additional approvals later. **Tivnan** - Acknowledged that additional funding is always beneficial, but noted that the town has already allocated significant resources to address PFAS issues in specific areas, such as the wastewater treatment plant. - Mentioned that the town allocated $2.5 million at the 2021 Annual Town Meeting for a PFAS destruction technology pilot program at the wastewater treatment plant. This program, which recently began its first round of testing, focuses on foam testing, targeting the PFAS-laden froth produced by the treatment process. - Clarified that the town has been proactive in addressing PFAS at the wastewater treatment facility, backed by regulations and approvals from the DEP, and has precedent from similar efforts at other facilities in Massachusetts. **Mohr** - Highlighted that, in the spirit of collaboration, all departments are actively communicating about how PFAS contamination crosses over into different areas of the town's operations. - Explained that one of the key discussions is focused on identifying the sources of PFAS entering the sewer system, with the goal of implementing destruction technology as far upstream as possible. - Acknowledged that these ongoing, extensive conversations across town departments are crucial for effectively addressing the PFAS issue.

VIII. FY25 CAPITAL REQUESTS AND OUT-YEAR DISCUSSION: TOWN ADMINISTRATION – LIGHT DETECTION & RANGING SURVEY (LIDAR)

Discussion:	**Greg Tivnan, Assistant Town Manager, provided an overview and responded to questions.** - Prepared this request on behalf of Holly Backus, the Town's Preservation Planner, as it aligns with the Select Board's strategic plan, particularly in the areas of historic preservation and transportation. - Explained that this request is part of a Community Preservation Committee (CPC) Grant, which requires the town to provide matching funds and complete preliminary work. - Specified that the preliminary work involves the use of light detection and ranging (LiDAR) technology, similar to ground-penetrating radar. This technology will map out sidewalks, historic curbing, and detect roots and other intrusions, focusing on the area of Upper Main Street and continuing along Pleasant Street.

	- Mentioned that the town has previously conducted similar work on Pleasant Street with a \$40,000 allocation. However, a recent quote for the new project came in around \$78,000 to \$80,000, leading to an estimate of approximately \$100,000 by the time the work is completed. **Libby Gibson, Town Manager** - Highlighted that the project has been a topic of discussion for some time, particularly focusing on areas like Upper Main Street, across from Pleasant Street, near the "Three Bricks" where large granite slabs have been significantly upended by tree roots. - Emphasized that this situation presents a challenge because removing the tree roots would mean losing the trees, which is not desirable. The town is seeking a solution that preserves both the historic granite slabs and the trees. - Stressed that any repairs must be carried out in a historically appropriate manner, requiring specialized expertise to design an effective fix.

IX.	**FY25 CAPITAL REQUESTS AND OUT-YEAR DISCUSSION: TOWN ADMINISTRATION – TICOMA WAY TOWN EMPLOYEE HOUSING**
Discussion:	**Libby Gibson, Town Manager, provided an overview and responded to questions.** - This project, which has been under discussion for some time, involves developing town-owned lots along Ticcoma Way for employee housing, aligning with the Select Board's strategic focus on community and employee housing. - Explained that while no specific design has been finalized, discussions with Matt MacEachern have considered various configurations, including a mix of single-family dwellings and duplexes, or all duplexes or all single-family homes. The goal is to maximize housing on the lot without overcrowding. - Mentioned the need to consider the mix of employees who would live there, recognizing that not all employee groups would mix well, such as department heads and their direct reports sharing the same duplex. The plan aims to include green spaces and adequate separation between units. - Estimated that the project could result in around eight units, though the exact number of bedrooms will depend on the final configuration. High-level estimates suggest that each unit could cost around \$1 million, excluding soft costs, furnishings, and other related expenses. - Noted that the total project cost is estimated at roughly \$8 million, with additional funds required for the unknown variables in construction costs, particularly on Nantucket, in the coming years. **Rick Sears, Assistant Town Manager** - Outlined that the preliminary street layout for the project includes eight 5,000-square-foot lots, with off-street parking planned for each unit. - Confirmed that the design ensures a minimum of two parking spots per building. - Reiterated that, as mentioned earlier, the units could be a mix of single-family homes and duplexes, depending on the final design choices. **Gibson** - Expressed concern about losing time given current staffing issues and the anticipated need for housing in the next three to five years, especially with potential retirements of high-level town positions. - Emphasized that having town-owned housing offers greater flexibility and control compared to renting, making it easier to address housing needs for incoming employees. - Acknowledged that while the project's numbers and design aren't finalized, the goal is to move forward without delay. The hope is to have a more detailed plan, possibly by Town

Meeting, but the complexity of other ongoing town projects and the hiring of a new housing director have slowed progress.

- Clarified that although several people are working on this, it's not full-time, and competing priorities have made it difficult to finalize the project. Nonetheless, the intention is to move ahead and not lose any more time in addressing the town's critical housing needs.

Mohr

- Clarified that the housing is intended for municipal employees across various departments, including the school, sewer, and airport, though the specific allocation policy has not yet been determined.
- Explained that the town currently uses license agreements, not leases, for employee housing, meaning that residency is tied to employment.
- Acknowledged the risks associated with employer-based housing, such as potential homelessness if employment is lost, but emphasized that it's a necessary risk for the municipality to take in order to address the housing crisis.
- Highlighted the importance of not delaying the project another year, even if the plan isn't fully finalized or the initial funding isn't sufficient to complete all units. The approach of developing multiple dwellings allows for phased construction, where some units can be built initially with the available funds, and additional units can be completed later as more funding becomes available.
- Expressed strong support for moving forward with the project, recognizing the critical need for housing and the importance of developing these lots as soon as possible, appreciating the efforts of the town staff in advancing this initiative.

Matz

- Agreed that this is a strong project and that it could be implemented incrementally, given the multiple buildings involved.
- Acknowledged that due to the current state of planning, breaking ground on the first housing unit in the 2025 fiscal year might be unlikely, although still possible.
- Suggested the idea of breaking down the overall project budget into smaller, phased installments across multiple fiscal years, rather than front-loading the entire amount.

Rector

- Recognized that while the project can be approached incrementally, certain elements, such as the streetcape and infrastructure, should be implemented on a broader scale to ensure efficiency.
- Acknowledged that while these larger tasks might take around six months, addressing them upfront is necessary to avoid repeated disruptions and inefficiencies.
- Emphasized that delaying any part of the process can lead to increased costs, reinforcing the importance of advancing the project as smoothly and quickly as possible.

Welch

- Requested additional detailed information to better evaluate the project, including a narrative with scenarios, illustrations, and a cost breakdown, especially for front-end costs.
- Acknowledged challenges in providing this information due to limited resources, but emphasized the importance of having it for informed decision-making.
- Suggested that the Town Manager and assistant managers gather and present this information at a future meeting so the project can be more concretely assessed and recommended.

Gibson

- Agreed to gather the supplemental information for a future meeting, though it was noted that it may take some time due to current commitments with personnel matters and the Special Town Meeting.

Vieth

- Expressed confusion about the different funding sources, like Housing Trust Fund (HTF) versus town funding, and how they impact who can live in the housing units.

	- Suggested that it would be helpful to have a better overview at some point, especially for those on the finance committee, to clarify which projects and units are dedicated to specific groups or open to everyone. - The goal is to ensure that everyone understands how the allocations work and who the intended residents are for each type of housing. **Welch** - Preferred making recommendations that are well-supported at Town Meeting, recognizing the growing dollar amounts and frequency of requests. - Highlighted the need for deeper information and resources to properly evaluate and develop these projects. - Suggested that the town might need to hire additional staff or consultants to coordinate these efforts, possibly under the umbrella of strategic projects, to ensure that projects are thoroughly planned and details are worked out in advance.

X. ANNUAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS WORKGROUP UPDATES	
Discussion:	**Welch** - Pleased to announce that PJ and Howard have volunteered for the task at hand, with the recruitment confirmed last week.

XI. COMMITTEE REPORTS	
Discussion:	None

XII. GOOD OF THE ORDER	
Discussion**:**	**Welch** - During the "Good of the Order" portion of the meeting, the focus was on committee self-reflection. This agenda item was intended to evaluate what the committee might be doing too much of, too little of, or incorrectly, as well as recognizing what is being done well. - Members were invited to share their thoughts, either today or at the next meeting, with the goal of understanding the perspectives of the committee's membership. - It was noted that, due to open meeting laws, these discussions should occur in an open meeting, and there were no concerns about adhering to that requirement. **Mohr** - Suggested setting an agenda item to invite Tucker Holland to discuss how housing units are allocated based on their funding sources. - Noted that this could clarify questions, such as who can live in airport-designated housing, and would be particularly helpful for the committee. - Offered to speak on topics like Chapter 40B, affirmative and fair housing, and the restrictions on units created by the Housing Trust, including how municipal preference is applied in projects on the SHI (Subsidized Housing Inventory) list. - Proposed taking five or ten minutes at a future meeting to provide this explanation, which would benefit the committee's understanding of housing allocation processes. **Welch** - Noted that the topic of housing allocation, while relevant, doesn't directly apply to the current requests being discussed, except for the licensing as a condition of employment. - Decided to footnote the topic for future discussion, planning to address it later in the season, after the committee reaches the point in the process where they do the RORI (Ranking of Relative Importance) evaluations.

	- Acknowledged that although this discussion will be a bit delayed, it will still be useful and helpful for the committee going forward. **Rector** - Suggested that it would be helpful to develop a white paper to better understand the broader context of the projects being discussed, particularly regarding potential funding sources the town could tap into, such as the Community Preservation Committee (CPC). - Highlighted the importance of articulating why the town is moving into the role of landlord, especially given the downsides of rental arrangements, as discussed earlier. - Emphasized that having these points clearly laid out on paper would not only benefit the committee but also be crucial when communicating with the public. - Proposed expanding the scope of the discussion slightly to include these aspects, ensuring a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities associated with these projects, without overwhelming the process. - Expressed concern about focusing too narrowly on just one or two subjects, as the broader context and multiple factors are crucial for decision-making. - Highlighted that the opportunity to gather comprehensive information extends beyond the committee and is important for a well-rounded understanding of the issues at hand. - Stressed the importance of having detailed, consolidated information to help in making informed decisions, ensuring that all aspects are considered as they play out. - Reiterated the goal of creating something meaningful by gathering and consolidating relevant information to support the committee's work and decisions. **Welch** - Clarified that the intent was not to avoid discussing these important topics, but rather to acknowledge that a broader discussion is necessary and should be planned for a dedicated meeting. - However, emphasized that this broader discussion was not part of the current agenda for today's meeting, which is why it was brought up that the topics should be addressed at a later time when they can be properly scheduled.

XIV. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Regular Meeting: October 19, 2023

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Motion:	**Motion to adjourn at 2:52pm.**
Roll-Call Vote:	Carried 7:0// Welch, Kaizer, Kickham, Matz, Mohr, Rector, Vieth (Aye)

Submitted by: Elaina Cano