



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	Thursday, May 29, 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-sgxA1fdoxteLNzRAUHIxA
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/85207632143?pwd=Vmq6wX2ep0l0uGMbbasVHkTB2lfxMz.1>

Meeting ID: 852 0763 2143

Passcode: 866870

1. Call to Order, Roll Call
2. Audio/Video Announcement
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Public Comment
5. Approval of Minutes from May 16, 2025
6. Review and Finalize RORI Changes
7. Committee Reports
8. Date of Next Meeting: TBD
9. Adjournment



Town of Nantucket Capital Program Committee May 16, 2025

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

The Capital Program Committee meeting on May 16, 2025, focused on refining the scoring criteria for evaluating capital projects. Key points included the need to prioritize cost over qualitative factors, with each category having a maximum score of 100%. The committee debated the inclusion of categories like appropriateness, community perception, and heritage, tradition, legacy, culture. They also discussed the importance of legal and regulatory compliance, maintaining current service levels, and addressing imminent issues. The meeting concluded with a plan to finalize the scoring criteria. The Capital Program Committee discussed the prioritization of departmental requests, emphasizing the need to differentiate between required and elective projects. They debated the importance of addressing legal and regulatory compliance, maintaining overburden capacity, and enhancing departmental functions. The committee proposed reordering priorities, with legal compliance as the highest, followed by overburden capacity and departmental function. They also considered adding a category for innovative or elective ideas. The meeting concluded with plans to draft a uniform list of questions for department heads.

Action Items

- [] Jill, Howard, and Christy to finalize the wording and categorization of the evaluation criteria before the next meeting.
- [] Christy to draft a list of standard questions to ask department heads during the capital project review process.
- [] Sue to communicate the changes to the capital project review process to the department heads when rolling out the FY27 cycle.

Roll Call and Approval of Agenda

- Jill Vieth calls the meeting to order and conducts a roll call.
- Roll Call: Dawn Hill-Holdgate aye, Howard Matz aye, John Kitchener aye, Jill Vieth aye.
- The meeting is audio and video recorded.
- Jill Vieth asks for approval of the agenda, which is motioned by John Kitchener and seconded by Dawn Hill-Holdgate.
- Roll Call Vote: John Kitchener aye, Dawn Hill-Holdgate aye, Howard Matz aye, Jill Vieth aye. Motion passes unanimously.

- The minutes from the April 17 meeting are approved with a motion made by Howard Matz and seconded by John Kitchener.
- Roll Call Vote: Howard Matz aye, John Kitchener aye, Dawn Hill-Holdgate aye, Jill Vieth aye. Motion passes unanimously.

Discussion on Scoring Criteria

- Jill Vieth and Howard Matz discuss the criteria for scoring capital projects.
- Jill Vieth suggests that cost should be weighted more heavily than qualitative factors.
- Howard Matz and Jill Vieth debate the exclusivity of scoring categories.
- John Kitchener suggests a simplified scoring system where each member has 100 points to allocate.

Debate on Scoring Methodology

- Christy Kickham and John Kitchener discuss the pros and cons of the current scoring method.
- Howard Matz argues for a more simplified scoring system to avoid overlapping categories.
- Jill Vieth and Christy Kickham discuss the importance of maintaining the current scoring method.
- The group debates the need for a more detailed scoring system versus a simpler one.

Review of Specific Scoring Categories

- The group reviews various scoring categories, including cost, appropriateness, and community perception.
- Jill Vieth and Howard Matz discuss the importance of cost as a primary factor in scoring.
- Christy Kickham suggests re-wording the appropriateness category to better reflect the committee's needs.
- The group debates the inclusion of certain categories, such as community perception and heritage, tradition, legacy, culture.

Finalizing Scoring Criteria

- The group finalizes the scoring criteria, including the importance of legal and regulatory compliance.
- Jill Vieth and Howard Matz discuss the need for a clear distinction between imminent issues and future growth demands.
- The group agrees on the importance of maintaining current levels of service and departmental function.
- Christy Kickham suggests adding a category for elective projects, which are not essential but could improve departmental function.

Discussion on Elective Departmental Requests

- Howard Matz and Christy Kickham discuss the value of elective departmental requests, emphasizing the need to word the problem effectively.
- Jill Vieth suggests that the question should prompt deeper thought, not just a yes or no answer.
- John Kitchener agrees, noting that the scoring should reflect the good idea behind the request.
- Christy Kickham mentions the need to fit the request into legal and regulatory categories, which fall under prioritization.

Clarifying the Value and Prioritization of Requests

- Howard Matz and Christy Kickham discuss the importance of clearly stating that the request is a good idea.
- Jill Vieth suggests that the scoring can reflect the value assigned to the request.
- Christy Kickham proposes moving on from the concept and thinking about it further.
- John Kitchener and Howard Matz discuss the need to mark the place with a placeholder and refine it later.

Subjective Value and Enhancement to Function

- Jill Vieth references a previous discussion about the value of requests, noting that some departments do not assign high value to certain requests.
- Christy Kickham explains that the request allows for subjective value assignment by the department head.
- John Kitchener emphasizes the need for clarity in the definition of the request.
- Howard Matz and Christy Kickham discuss the importance of integrating the elective request into the prioritization process.

Examples of Elective Requests

- Jill Vieth provides examples of elective requests, such as a fire station or a police station, which are not required but are considered good ideas.
- Christy Kickham agrees, noting that such requests can take years to get through the process.
- John Kitchener suggests that the definition should be broad enough to cover various types of requests.
- Howard Matz and Christy Kickham discuss the importance of clear communication with department heads about the request process.

Refining the Prioritization Criteria

- Jill Vieth lists the prioritization criteria: address legal or regulatory compliance, maintain overburden capacity, maintain departmental function, and allow for enhancement of function.

- Christy Kickham suggests reordering the criteria, emphasizing the importance of legal compliance as the highest priority.
- Jill Vieth agrees, noting that compliance with state regulations is crucial for certain projects.
- Howard Matz and Christy Kickham discuss the need to simplify and clean up the criteria.

Subjective and Innovative Ideas

- Jill Vieth and Christy Kickham discuss the importance of allowing for subjective and innovative ideas in the request process.
- John Kitchener suggests avoiding negative connotations, such as "not required," and focusing on positive terms like "innovative idea."
- Caroline Baltzer emphasizes the importance of subjective value assignment by department heads.
- Howard Matz and Jill Vieth discuss the need to balance subjective and objective criteria in the request process.

Feedback from Finance

- Susan Carmel provides feedback on the discussion, noting the difficulty of rating requests based on the timeline for spending funds.
- Jill Vieth and John Kitchener discuss the importance of a prescribed timeline for project completion.
- Howard Matz and Susan Carmel agree that the need for additional funds to complete a project should be considered.
- Christy Kickham suggests adding this criterion to the prioritization process.

Closing Remarks and Next Steps

- Jill Vieth and Christy Kickham discuss the need to be clear about total project costs and funding already spent in reports to the Finance Committee and Select Board.
- Susan Carmel suggests having a list of uniform questions for departments to ensure consistency in the request process.
- Howard Matz and Jill Vieth agree to start drafting a list of uniform questions and refining the prioritization criteria.
- John Kitchener emphasizes the need to communicate the changes to the department heads.
- The group concludes the discussion on scoring criteria and plans to finalize the list for the next meeting.
- Jill Vieth and Susan Carmel discuss the need to update the forms and processes for departmental requests.
- The group agrees to review the scoring criteria and forms before the next meeting.
- The meeting is adjourned with a plan to reconvene and finalize the scoring criteria.
- Motion to adjourn made by Howard Matz, seconded by John Kitchener.
- Roll Call vote: Howard Matz aye, John Kitchener aye, Caroline Baltzer aye, Christy Kickham aye, Jill Vieth aye. Motion passes unanimously.