



Town of Nantucket Capital Program Committee October 3, 2024 Minutes

Staff:	Susan Carmel, Assistant Finance Director, Mike Burns, Planning & Economic Development, Drew Patnode, Public Works Director
Attending Members:	Jill Veith, Chair, Peter Kaizer, Vice-Chair, Christy Kickham, John Kitchner
Absent Members:	Howard Matz, Dawn Hill-Holdgate

The Capital Program Committee meeting on October 3, 2024, discussed annual roadworks appropriations, including a \$2 million request for FY26 due to ongoing and upcoming projects like the sewer force main project and Surfside Area Transportation improvements. The Tom Nevers multi-use path project requires \$2.3 million for land acquisition and \$6.8 million in total. The committee also considered a pilot one-way configuration on Pleasant Street to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety. Concerns were raised about the quality of paving and the impact of utility work on road conditions. The committee emphasized the importance of data-driven decisions and open discussions in evaluating project requests. The Capital Program Committee discussed the ranking process for capital projects, emphasizing the need for more dialogue and understanding of project criteria. They debated whether to discuss projects before or after ranking, with some preferring pre-discussion to influence rankings. The committee also considered the impact of their rankings on project funding and the importance of detailed narratives in requests. They clarified the ranking process, ensuring percentages are relative to criteria. The meeting concluded with plans for future meetings and site visits, including a DPW central fleet and facility visit and an airport meeting on October 24th.

Action Items

- Finalize the preferred alignment and design for the Tom Nevers multi-use path project and coordinate with abutters to determine easement needs.
- Conduct appraisals and finalize the budget for the land acquisitions and easement takings for the Tom Nevers multi-use path project.
- Provide an update on the status of the Tom Nevers multi-use path project and the land acquisition process before the next town meeting.

Outline

Roll Call and Meeting Introduction

- Vieth opens the meeting, noting the date as October 3, 2024
- Roll call: Vieth, Kaizer, Kickham, Kitchener
- Vieth reminds attendees that the meeting is audio and video recorded and asks for approval of the agenda.
- Kaizer motions to approve the agenda, Kitchener seconds. Approved 4-0
- Vieth calls for public comment. (None)

Annual Roadworks Appropriations

- Drew Patnode discusses the annual roadworks appropriations, including sidewalk improvement plans, island-wide road improvements, multi-use path maintenance, and cobblestone improvements.
- He highlights the reduction in funding for island-wide road improvements from \$3 million in FY 25 to \$2 million in FY 26 due to ongoing and upcoming projects.
- Drew mentions specific projects like the sewer force main project, airport projects, and the Surfside Area Transportation improvements.
- He emphasizes the need for realistic funding estimates based on current and future projects.

Questions and Clarifications on Roadworks

- Peter Kaizer questions the volatility in funding requests, and Drew explains the need to be realistic about what can be accomplished with the available resources.

Tom Nevers Multi-Use Path Project

- Drew Patnode introduces the Tom Nevers multi-use path project, which includes final design, property acquisitions, and easement takings.
- Mike Burns explains the process of coordinating with abutters and the potential need for eminent domain.
- Christy Kickham asks about the alignment of the path and the possibility of it deviating from the road.
- Mike Burns and Drew Patnode discuss the design considerations, including the impact of e-bikes and the need for sufficient sight distance at driveways.

Discussion on Bike Path Design and Safety

- John Kitchener inquires about the impact of e-bikes on bike path design and safety.
- Mike Burns explains the design considerations for bike paths, including width, curvature, and the need for sufficient sight distance at driveways.
- Christy Kickham suggests posting signage to remind drivers of their responsibility when exiting driveways.
- Drew Patnode and Mike Burns discuss the importance of clear communication and signage to ensure safety for both cyclists and drivers.

Pleasant Street Corridor Improvements

- Drew Patnode discusses the final design improvements for Pleasant Street from five corners to the roundabout at Lake Hooper Farm.
- Mike Burns mentions the upcoming pilot project to test a one-way configuration on Pleasant Street.
- Christy Kickham and Peter Kaizer express concerns about the potential impact on traffic flow and the need for careful planning.
- Drew Patnode explains the rationale behind the pilot project and the importance of gathering feedback to inform the final design.

Quality of Paving and Road Maintenance

- Christy Kickham questions the quality of paving and the appearance of unfinished roads.
- Drew Patnode explains the challenges of maintaining roads due to constant utility work and the need for temporary paving.
- He discusses the use of different paving techniques, including milling and overlay, and the importance of proper installation.
- Peter Kaizer raises concerns about recent depressions in roads around drainage grates and manholes, which Drew attributes to both degradation and improper installation.

Discussion on Paving Techniques and Materials

- Christy Kickham asks about the difference between overlay and milling.
- Drew Patnode explains the process of milling to reclaim the asphalt and the benefits of overlaying in certain situations.
- He mentions the use of unique pavement materials and the potential for using products like Aqua Fault for small-scale repairs.
- Peter Kaizer suggests considering the use of Aqua Fault for specific applications, and Drew acknowledges the need for efficient and effective solutions.

Final Remarks and Next Steps

- Jill Vieth thanks Drew Patnode and Mike Burns for their presentation and discussion.
- The committee discusses the timeline for completing the RORI evaluations, with a target date of December 1.
- John Kitchener raises concerns about the accuracy and consistency of the RORI process, prompting a discussion on the importance of clear communication and frameworks for decision-making.
- The meeting concludes with a commitment to continue refining the evaluation process and ensuring thorough discussion and consideration of all requests.

Discussion on Request Evaluation Process

- Christy Kickham emphasizes the importance of discussing requests to understand different perspectives.
- Peter Kaizer questions if the lack of discussion is due to time allocation or a system flaw.

- Jill Vieth agrees on the need for discussions and mentions the framework provided by the system.
- Christy Kickham suggests that discussions might be case-specific, with some requests needing more discussion than others.

Historical Context and Previous Practices

- Peter Kaizer recalls that discussions were held last year and every year.
- Jill Vieth mentions that requests with scores between 40% and 50% were discussed in the past.
- Christy Kickham notes that discussions were reactive based on the scores.
- Peter Kaizer describes the process of going through each request and marking them with an "X" for further discussion.

John Kitchener's Perspective and 80/20 Rule

- John Kitchener shares his approach of ranking requests based on the 80/20 rule, focusing on the 20% that account for 80% of the cost.
- Jill Vieth and Peter Kaizer discuss the importance of understanding the impact of the 20% of projects that consume the most money.
- John Kitchener explains his method of focusing on the 20% of projects that have the most significant financial impact.
- Jill Vieth suggests that discussing requests before ranking them might influence the ranking process.

Framework and Individual Interpretation

- Christy Kickham defends the current framework, which allows for individual interpretation and discussion.
- Peter Kaizer explains that the process is designed for individual interpretation and ranking, not for reaching a unanimous conclusion.
- John Kitchener expresses a preference for more discussion to understand different perspectives.
- Christy Kickham and Jill Vieth agree that the framework allows for discussions and adjustments based on individual criteria.

Detailed Explanation of Scoring Process

- Peter Kaizer provides a detailed explanation of how to score requests, emphasizing the importance of relative percentages.
- John Kitchener seeks clarification on how to correctly fill out the scoring form, including the use of percentages.
- Peter Kaizer explains the hierarchical relationship between high, medium, and low priorities.
- Christy Kickham and Jill Vieth provide additional context on how to interpret and score requests.

Impact of Big Ticket Items

- John Kitchener observes that big ticket items have a significant impact on the overall process.
- Peter Kaizer and Jill Vieth discuss the challenges of managing long lists of requests and the need for efficient discussions.
- Christy Kickham notes that the process was different before Zoom, making discussions more personal.
- John Kitchener expresses a desire to understand the correct scoring process to ensure his contributions are valuable.

Role of the Committee and Departmental Requests

- John Kitchener questions the committee's role in making broader recommendations, such as standardizing security cameras across departments.
- Jill Vieth explains that the committee's focus is on individual requests, not broader policy changes.
- Peter Kaizer agrees that the committee's role is to evaluate requests, not to make departmental policy changes.
- John Kitchener acknowledges the need for a separate forum to discuss broader policy recommendations.

Coordination and Future Meetings

- Jill Vieth and Susan Carmel discuss the scheduling of future meetings, including a continuation of the DPW central fleet and facility discussion.
- John Kitchener suggests that the airport manager should provide detailed information in advance to streamline discussions.
- Peter Kaizer agrees that having detailed information beforehand would improve the flow of the meeting.
- Jill Vieth confirms the next meeting date and time, emphasizing the importance of coordination and preparation
- Kickham motions to adjourn the meeting, Kitchener seconds. Approved 4-0