Comprehensive Capital Budget Committee
MEETING MINUTES
Friday, December 9, 2022
Location – Remote Meeting on Zoom

Members present: Chris Doyle, Aaron Pikcilingis, Larry Link, Kate Bowen, Susan Burgess-Cox, Pat Brusch, Melinda Huang
Members absent: Claus Becker, Adam Dash
Other attendees: Jennifer Hewitt, Assistant Town Administrator

[Chair Chris Doyle called meeting to order at 7:33am]

1. Minutes review and approval
    a. Approved minutes of 11/22/2022
        i. Pat moves approval
        ii. Larry seconds
        iii. Vote: approved unanimously (7-0)
        iv. Brief discussion on the density of the minutes -- should they be more action-focused in the future?
        v. Susan suggests that they are fine as is for now and can shift to be more action-oriented as we settle in a little
    b. Approved minutes of 12/02/2022
        i. Pat moves approval
        ii. Susan seconds
        iii. Vote: approved unanimously (7-0)
2. Screening/Ranking of Projects
    a. Susan shared a proposal for our FY24 process "*FY24 Prioritization and Screening Process*"
        i. This is a higher-level version of the detailed, comprehensive materials Melinda and Claus had created & includes an outline of the process and a scoring rubric for the evaluation of proposed capital projects
        ii. Melinda provides insight on the rationale behind the development of this process and scoring framework
        iii. Claus and Melinda have also created supporting materials, including a template, a sample scorecard, and an excel file to hold data on all projects
    b. Discussion: the scoring and process we will use to prioritize and select submissions
        i. To develop: The definition of scoring thresholds / a detailed rubric within each of the six categories
        ii. Susan notes that we might do well to combine the previous process and an updated process
        iii. Tight timeline for turning around FY24 year
        iv. Chris suggests a stepped process for process

1. Do our best for this year and refine over time
                    2. Could we continue the previous process and *test* a new process in parallel?
                    3. Susan suggests a hybrid of the two processes to act as a bridge to our eventual, more permanent process
                    4. Jennifer Hewitt likes the idea of testing this new process and rubric in parallel to something more akin to the previous process -- moving from theoretical to practical
            v.   Kate asks how the points in this process were developed and would appreciate seeing other, related materials and suggests testing this on items that have come through in the past
                    1. Action: Test a sample of past projects
            vi. Chris: Important to make the process transparent, balancing challenges of communicating a more complex processes
            vii. How many submissions are we expecting to evaluate?
            viii. Kate suggests adding more detail to the evaluation criteria for each measure
            ix. Note: The minimum threshold was previously $10k and should probably move to $25k
                    1. Kate asks: If we move to $25k, what happens to the projects below that threshold?
                            a. Tabling this for a later,more in-depth discussion in a future meeting
            x.   Possible process: where we use this as a means of identifying where we need more information and which projects, generally, are coming to the top, then apply something more akin to the process used in the past (Aaron suggests, Susan concurs)
                    1. This can work well for identifying high-priority, bigger projects that require a multi-year approach (past example: Chenery roof) but can't be funded in a single year
    c. Discussion: Practical next steps
        i.   Jennifer share a set of sample projects
        ii. **Melinda will revise and connect with Susan to continue improving this framework to align with our phased plan (include Aaron as optional)**
3. Review of FY23 capital budget
    a. Reviewed the Report to Town Meeting, which is the enacted Capital Budget for the year ("*FY23 Capital Budget Committee - Final Report.pdf*," available on the Town Website)
        i.   The most recent report has not been posted to the Town website
        ii. Chris: Could there be an addendum added to the report to include any changes to the official report of the previous committee?
                1. Pat: Prefers the idea of an addendum to indicate what exactly was approved at Town Meeting

<div align="center">**a. Pat will connect with Susan on this**</div>

      iii.   Pat provided an overview of report and rationale for its structure

      iv.   Our report will need to provide explanations/rationale for why some things get funded and others do not

            1. Larry: Asks whether we approve beyond the budget and note which couldn't be supported

                a. In the past, the CBC Chair would indicate total $ requests vs. $ funded, but those unfunded requests would go into the 5-year plan

                b. Differentiating between all requests, requests that should be funded, and requests that *could* be funded

                c. Important to people to understand why some projects get funded and others don't (the prioritization scheme may help with this)

                d. Pat: Department priorities may not be Town priorities

    b. "Capital Budget Book" -- submissions

4. Upcoming meetings
   a. 12/16 @ 7:30am
   b. Potential meeting 12/23 @ 7:30am
   c. No meeting on 12/30
   d. January schedule to be shared with Jennifer Hewtitt to facilitate meetings with representatives from requesting Departments
      i. Potentially meet with departments using non-quorum-sized groups
         1. Probably not ideal for this first year
      ii. Potentially schedule a longer meeting and have reps from depts come at a time within the longer window -- consolidates the timeline vs. many small meetings
      iii. Chris will draft agendas and schedule

Motionto adjourn: Susan; Second Pat
Votes: moved via unanimous consent
[Meeting adjourned at 8:55am]

Minutes prepared by Aaron Pikcilingis