



MEETING POSTING

TOWN OF NANTUCKET

Pursuant to MGL Chapter 30A, § 18-25

All meeting **notices and agenda** must be filed and time stamped with the Town Clerk's Office and posted at least 48 hours prior to the meeting (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Holidays)



Committee/Board/s	Capital Program Committee
Day, Date, and Time	Friday, May 16, 2025 @ 2:00 PM
Location / Address	IN-PERSON PARTICIPATION at 131 Pleasant Street, Room A (Trailer) REMOTE PARTICIPATION VIA ZOOM The meeting will be aired at a later time on the Town's Government TV YouTube Channel https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC-sgxAlfdoxteLNzRAUHIxA
Signature of Chair or Authorized Person	Susan M. Carmel

WARNING:

IF THERE IS NO QUORUM OF MEMBERS PRESENT, OR IF MEETING POSTING IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OML STATUTE, NO MEETING MAY BE HELD!

AGENDA

Please list below the topics the chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85642429673?pwd=lpTiywrnox7ficcwVogc860gMaCpp0.1>

Meeting ID: 856 4242 9673

Passcode: 346295

1. Call to Order, Roll Call
2. Audio/Video Announcement
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Public Comment
5. Approval of Minutes from April 17, 2025
6. Review RORI Criteria and Scoring
7. Committee Reports
8. Date of Next Meeting: TBD
9. Adjournment



Town of Nantucket Capital Program Committee April 17, 2025

Attending Members:	Jill Vieth, Chair, Peter Kaizer, Vice Chair, Christy Kickham, Howard Matz, Dawn-Hill Holdgate, John Kitchener, Caroline Baltzer
Staff:	Susan Carmel, Assistant Finance Director
Absent	

The Capital Program Committee meeting on April 17, 2025, focused on refining the criteria for evaluating capital projects. Key points included the need to update the criteria to better reflect current priorities, such as urgency, legal requirements, and departmental function. The committee discussed the importance of reducing operating costs, improving efficiency, and addressing energy consumption. They also emphasized the need for clear and specific criteria to ensure transparency and effectiveness in their evaluations. The meeting concluded with a plan to finalize the updated criteria and prepare for future discussions with department heads. The Capital Program Committee discussed the importance of community perception and heritage in project evaluation. They proposed renaming categories to reflect these values, including "community engagement" and "qualitative justification." They emphasized the need for clear communication and public buy-in, using examples like airport housing and vehicle storage buildings. The committee agreed on three main categories: prioritization, qualitative justification, and cost efficiency. They plan to finalize the scoring system and criteria in a follow-up meeting, aiming to align with the town's strategic plan and ensure effective public communication.

Action Items

- [] Susan Carmel to provide the Select Board's strategic plan to the committee prior to the next meeting.
- [] Review and provide feedback on the revised criteria categories.
- [] Schedule a follow-up meeting in mid-May to finalize the criteria and scoring system.

Discussion on Agenda

- Jill Vieth calls for the meeting to begin
- The agenda is approved with a motion made by John Kitchener and seconded by Caroline Baltzer.
- Roll call vote: John aye, Peter aye, Howard aye, Caroline aye, Christy aye, Jill aye. Passes unanimously.
- Jill Vieth suggests a free-form discussion to keep the meeting brief.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

- Jill Vieth asks if the minutes from the previous meeting have been read, and Susan Carmel confirms they can be approved all at once.
- Jill Vieth calls for a motion to approve the minutes, motion made by Caroline Baltzer, seconded by John Kitchener.
- Roll call vote: Caroline aye, Christy aye, Howard aye, John aye, Peter aye, Jill aye. Passes unanimously.

Review and Discussion of Criteria Document

- John Kitchener suggests updating the criteria to reflect current priorities, and Howard Matz agrees, noting the need for a draft.
- Susan Carmel shares her screen to show the current criteria document, which includes various categories like continuity, cost, and resilience.
- Jill Vieth and Howard Matz discuss the need to redefine certain categories, such as continuity A and B, to better reflect current priorities.
- Christy Kickham questions the usefulness of certain criteria, suggesting they be reworked for clarity and consistency.
- The group agrees to focus on redefining the categories and creating a more coherent set of criteria.

Proposed Changes to Criteria Categories

- Jill Vieth suggests creating four main categories: cost, strategic plan, independent commission priorities, and cultural heritage.
- Howard Matz proposes starting with the criteria and then grouping them, rather than vice versa.
- The group discusses the importance of clear and specific criteria, with suggestions to rename certain categories for better clarity.
- Christy Kickham emphasizes the need for clear and exclusive criteria to avoid confusion and ensure consistency in evaluations.

Discussion on Specific Criteria and Their Relevance

- The group debates the relevance of various criteria, such as urgency, legal requirement, and departmental function.
- Jill Vieth and Christy Kickham discuss the importance of prioritizing certain criteria over others, such as legal requirements and departmental function.
- John Kitchener suggests adding criteria related to the appropriateness of cost and the justification of funds.
- The group agrees to keep certain criteria, such as urgency and legal requirement, while redefining others for better clarity.

Evaluation of Cost and Budget Considerations

- The group discusses the importance of evaluating the cost of projects and the appropriateness of the budget.
- Jill Vieth suggests adding criteria related to the impact on the taxpayer and the overall cost to the town.
- Howard Matz proposes adding criteria related to the justification of cost and the reasonableness of the budget.
- The group agrees to include criteria related to the appropriateness of cost and the justification of funds in the evaluation process.

Finalizing the Criteria and Next Steps

- The group reviews the proposed criteria and makes final adjustments, ensuring clarity and relevance.
- Jill Vieth suggests creating a guide for department heads to prepare for their meetings with the committee.
- Howard Matz proposes including specific questions for department heads to ensure they are well-prepared for their discussions.
- The group agrees to finalize the criteria and prepare for the next meeting, where they will review the updated document and discuss further refinements.

Discussion on Cultural Value and Community Perception

- Howard Matz asks about other large, global categories to consider.
- Jill Vieth questions if cultural value should be its own category.
- Christy Kickham emphasizes the importance of community perception.
- Howard Matz suggests renaming the category to reflect community perception.
- Caroline Baltzer and Howard Matz discuss the impact of community perception on decisions like airport housing.

Long-Term Value and Budget Prioritization

- Christy Kickham uses the example of a roof to explain long-term benefits.
- Jill Vieth relates this to the importance of necessary functions in prioritization.
- Christy Kickham discusses the difficulty of evaluating the value of big budget projects.
- Jill Vieth mentions Steven's approach to ranking based on necessity.
- Christy Kickham suggests that the value of projects should be evaluated at the time of payment, not after.

Challenges in Communicating Project Value

- Jill Vieth and Christy Kickham discuss the importance of clear communication about project benefits.

- Caroline Baltzer highlights the role of communications and PR in keeping the public informed.
- Christy Kickham points out the need for site inspections and design presentations.
- Caroline Baltzer emphasizes the importance of maintaining public interest during project development.
- Jill Vieth suggests asking requesters about their plans to keep the public informed.

Renaming and Refining Categories

- Howard Matz proposes renaming categories for clarity and relevance.
- Jill Vieth and Christy Kickham discuss the importance of clear names for categories.
- Howard Matz suggests renaming "qualitative justification" to "community engagement and grant application."
- Jill Vieth and Christy Kickham agree on the need for clear and concise category names.
- Howard Matz outlines the three categories: prioritization, qualitative justification, and cost.

Finalizing Categories and Next Steps

- Jill Vieth and Howard Matz discuss the finalization of categories and their importance.
- Christy Kickham suggests focusing on "bang for the buck" as a summary of project value.
- Jill Vieth emphasizes the need for clear criteria for scoring projects.
- Howard Matz suggests weighing categories based on individual importance.
- The group agrees to meet again to finalize the scoring system and review the list of projects.

Scheduling and Meeting Logistics

- The group discusses potential meeting dates and times to finalize the criteria.
- Jill Vieth suggests meeting after town meeting but before the election.
- Howard Matz and Christy Kickham discuss their availability for the next meeting.
- The group agrees to meet on May 16th to finalize the criteria and scoring system.

Reviewing Select Board Priorities

- Christy Kickham requests the Select Board's strategic plan to align with their priorities.
- The group discusses the importance of understanding the Select Board's priorities.
- Jill Vieth suggests reviewing the Select Board's strategic plan before the next meeting.
- The group agrees to review the Select Board's strategic plan to ensure alignment with their goals.
- The meeting concludes with a plan to finalize the criteria and scoring system in the next meeting.
- Motion to adjourn made by Caroline Baltzer, seconded made by Christy Kickham. Motion to adjourn passes unanimously.