

DATE: March 13, 2023
TIME: 3:12 PM

Comprehensive Capital Budget Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Friday, February 3, 2023

Location – Remote Meeting on Zoom

Members present: Pat Brusch, Aaron Pikcilingis, Adam Dash, Larry Link, Catherine Bowen, Melinda Huang, Claus Becker, Chris Doyle, Susan Burgess-Cox

Members absent: None

Other attendees: None

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

Agenda

1. Minutes
 - a. Approved minutes of 12/23/2022 meeting
 - i. Motion: S. Burgess-Cox, Second: C. Becker
 - ii. Vote: Yes: 7; No: 0; Abstain: 2 (P. Brusch, A. Pikcilingis))
2. Funding Sources and bonding projects
 - a. Discussion: bonding the pumper truck vs. other project opportunities (e.g., some of the work at Burbank - either its roof or the gym floor)
 - i. P. Brusch notes that we have a town policy setting the limit on the amount of debt we will take under the levy limit, and previously the CBC would vote on how much to bond
 1. This vote and practice contributes to our bond rating
 - ii. Approving the bonded truck is choosing a project (against the budget)
 - b. C. Doyle notes the the amount of bonding under the levy limit will increase as our old debts are paid off
 - i. Question: Does bonding the pumper truck preclude us from bonding other projects like the Butler or CMS roof?
 1. **C. Doyle will pose this question to J. Hewitt**
 - ii. Discussion: Strategies, details, sources, and possible uses of under-the-limit bonding
 1. **C. Doyle will ask J. Hewitt for the Town's current debt information chart and distribute to the committee members**
 - a. This will help us understand how much space there might be this year, and in the future, to issue new bonds for capital
 - iii. We will continue this discussion in the future with more information in hand
3. Presentation of needs beyond year 5
 - a. Discussion: what do we want to compile beyond year 5 for our presentation at Annual Town Meeting?

- i. M. Huang: Adding more detail about what range of years a given large project might appear in
- ii. C. Doyle: For this year, we should present a plan through year 10, in subsequent years we will present more detail out to year 30
 - 1. For this year, many projects will be in the “beyond year 10” kind of category
 - 2. We can build known expenses like replacement of large equipment (e.g., fire trucks) on a reasonably predictable schedule for the 30-year plan
 - a. There exists a number of projects we don’t know about yet
 - 3. We will probably need to put projects into a bucket for “Years 6-10” as opposed to specific years within that range
 - 4. P. Brusch notes the staffing shortages may hinder departments’ ability to provide the necessary level of detail to place future projects into specific years
- iii. **L. Link will work with C. Doyle to fill in some of the details for beyond 5 years**
 - 1. C. Bowen asks about an inventory of all projects that will help us get started on this effort
 - a. The missing pieces are major technology, equipment, vehicles, and the like
 - b. A. Pikilingis notes tha the building, sidewalk, and roads assessment requests, if funded, might be a good source of information

4. Ranking projects Exercise

- a. C. Becker reviewed the tool we used and provided an overview of the results of committee members’ entries about the projects requests
- b. A. Pikilingis suggests adding more nuance to provide more detail in each criteria (e.g. high, medium, low, none)
- c. Discussion: What are the key criteria, process, and goals of our use of this tool
 - i. M. Huang notes that we had a slightly different set of criteria in the rubric we developed in December
 - ii. A. Pikilingis suggests that we not artificially limit the number of benefits that we can indicate for any given project
 - iii. Further discussion of how to capture mandates, town strategies, and other considerations within a reasonably facile tool
 - 1. Goals are to help focus our efforts & discussion and provide some transparency about the decisions we make on requests
 - 2. Key questions:
 - a. How might we score requests toward these ends?
 - b. How might we develop operational definitions for each criterion?
 - c. C. Bowen suggests adding some measure of risk that a given project addresses

3. Next steps:
 - a. **M. Huang and C. Becker will connect to further refine the tool**
 - i. Adding likert-style scales for each field
 - ii. Update the criteria
 - iii. Provide working definitions of each criterion
 - iv. L. Link asks about the process for Town Meeting input on the decision and reports from our committee (e.g., if a Town Meeting Member disagrees with the prioritization)
 1. P. Brusch related an example about this happening in the recent past with school librarian funding
5. Spring calendar and topics
 - a. **C. Doyle will connect with the Town Administrator's office, then circulate information about the deadlines and schedules for submitting our report, presentations to the Select Board, Warrant Committee, and Town Meeting**
 - b. Discussion: our responsibility to analyze the possibility that a given project or effort be regionalized, outsourced, or privatized
 - i. **A Pikcilingis will share links to reports from the Strutucal Change Impact Group recommending that town efforts make these considerations and will send a brief, draft list of considerations as a starting point**
 - ii. C. Bowen suggests adding some indication of these considerations in the scoring tool
 1. Maybe this could be abstracted into a standard set of questions that should be asked -- perhaps in a separate tool -- about each request (e.g., "could/should this be regionalized?")
 2. These questions could be posed to the requesters as they develop their requests or as part of our standard interviews about the requests
6. Public Comment
 - a. No members of the public present

[Meeting adjourned at 8:52]

Motion C. Becker

Accepted via unanimous consent

Scheduled Upcoming meetings:

Thursday February 9, 7pm (Budget Summit)

Friday, February 17, 7:30am

Minutes prepared by Aaron Pikcilingis