

Meeting Minutes

City of Nashua
Capital Improvements Committee
March 27, 2023
CDD Small Conference Room, 5:00 PM

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM by Sam Durfee, Planning Department Manager, and Secretary to the Capital Improvement Committee

Members Present: (Roll Call)

Charlie Budris
Ald. Jette
Sam Durfee
John Griffin
Bob Canaway
Rose Evans
Larry Szetela in at 5:10 pm

Sam Durfee: Review of ranking criteria, A being essential highest priority, Projects which are required to complete or renovate a major public improvement; projects which will remedy a condition dangerous to the health, safety, and welfare of the public; or projects which will provide facilities for a critically needed community program.

B Desirable second priority, Projects which will benefit the community; whose validity of planning and timing have been established. C Acceptable third priority, Projects which are adequately planned, but which can be postponed if budget reductions are necessary. D Deferrable fourth priority, Projects which are definitely recommended for postponement or elimination from the capital improvements program since they pose serious questions of adequate planning, proper timing, or community need. E Other, Those projects presented as capital improvement projects by various departments but which in the CIC's opinion do not meet the definition of a capital improvement project as such as which are more appropriately funded in another manner, Non-prioritized. Any Questions on the criteria.

Bob Canaway: Can we approved the minutes before we

Sam Durfee: yes thank you,

Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes of March 7, 2023 Meeting

Motion to approve as written: Bob Canaway

Seconded: John Griffin

Sam Durfee: The ranking sheet went out to everyone, feel free to mark your scores, we will be recording them electronically, through excel spreadsheet. If at any time we need to take a look at a project I do have the document up here (on computer screen).

Rose Evans: So we are ranking Out-Year Projects?

Sam Durfee: Yes, We did talk at the last meeting that we could just say other if we wanted to be quick about it, we did talk about assigning a ranking to any of the Enterprise Funds, the point being that its ranked in some way shape or form, it's in the plan, we wouldn't have to come back and hold a special meeting, but we certainly could if we felt we needed to change the ranking. So we can get started with FY24.

Alderman Jette: Could I just ask a question before, these Airport projects, in the past those were pretty much A's,

Sam Durfee: in that case do we all want to just list these all as A's?

No

Sam Durfee: that sounds good,

Bob Canaway: it goes pretty fast anyway.

Sam Durfee: OK, I'm sure it will once we..

Larry Szetela arrives to the meeting.

Ranking Resumes. Marcia Wilkins calls out the project name and asks for A's B's C's D's or E's. Scoring is recorded by Larry Szetela, and Sam Durfee.

(Attach Ranking Sheet to minutes)

Out-Year Projects discussion

Bob Canaway: Some of them we saw they were complete applications, and some are literally just place holders. That was one of the things we had concern over, at the last meeting was ranking something without having it actually prepared at the same level of completeness. Are we going to try to rank those or others that were presented as well? Some are complete, like the Airport projects for example, I don't think those are just place holders. How are we going to take this, I guess? I think that the Administrative projects and the new parking garage,

Sam Durfee: that got to the conversation about the rankings not really meshing with out-year project considerations that are not written in a way, it comes down to how prepared is this application, rather than project validity. That does beg the question do we, I suppose we could make an amendment to our rules or ranking priorities. These don't really fit under E, because these would qualify as capital improvement projects because of the cost. But because we want to get them on the plan, and the ranking does really seem to matter these will receive their due rankings when we are in the applicable fiscal year, again this is to serve the purpose of having them in the plan and we don't have to have the special meeting for bonding criteria. What is E, that is projects that do not meet the definition of a capital improvement project or more appropriately funded in another manner. Which these would not be.

Bob Canaway: They might fit the definition of D better, they are not adequately planned, or C,

Rose Evans: recommended for postponement,

Bob Canaway: ya, which is kind of how I take it, if it's not something we need.

Same Durfee: in the context of we're ranking FY24 projects these by being out-year projects they are postponed or deferred into the out-years. The projects have been given target years, when we say D, are we deferring them off of their target year?

Bob Canaway: why wouldn't be take them back up when we do those particular years?

Sam Durfee: I will say that Scott LeClair did provide rankings based on his view of the importance of the project , but if I remember correctly from the meeting he was open to however, but I think he was just on a roll as he was doing it. We could rank them all as D, just to give them a ranking or we could go through each one.

Alderman Jette: Wouldn't C be more appropriate, because D is definitely recommended for postponement or elimination

Sam Durfee: Postponement OR elimination so not necessarily elimination but C, says that projects are adequately planned, which I don't think all of these are, I think that a number was just stuck to them, there are no estimates on some of them sure, but not all of them. Do the Airport projects really deserve a D, those clearly are planned out, funding's lock-in but it's just for a specific year. These criteria don't fit with what we are trying to do with out-year projects.

Bob Canaway: I think we need to go back to the drawing board, on the process on these because I love the idea that we're thinking about things that are not immediate needs. My biggest fear is that we give them a ranking and we don't see them again, which might happen anyway, that sort of circumvents the process.

Sam Durfee: The departments are free to reevaluate their priorities and not resubmit a project. To be fair to the Departments this is the first year that we have actually asked them for out-year projects. They have never gone through the exercise of flushing out an application for these projects like what they do for their current fiscal year projects, and by that nature we wouldn't be seeing projects that have been planned out. Maybe for consideration for next CIP cycle perhaps we have a meeting early in the process and we talk about ranking criteria for out-year projects we not in a position right now to change things for this meeting, but we can have a conversation about how we establish new ranking criteria for out-year projects or we modify what we have to better fit with what we are trying to do with out-year.

Marcia Wilkins: do we want to take, like what we do with EF, do we want to take like department of Administrative, do you want to vote on them collectively, rather than individually? Certainly the Airport, like you said is the same.

Alderman Jette: It sounds like for the Airport, we don't want to give them a D, so maybe the Airport is C's and the rest of them are D's.

Sam Durfee: I would be willing to go higher on the Airport, Some of these, like the second one down, the City Share is \$0, I could not possibly give that anything other than an A. I think the only ones we really need to have a conversation about are the Airport ones, ones that have actually received estimates, such as the Millyard Dog Park. Some where the numbers are a bit more granular and in need of more analysis and planning. Some of these form Engineering, these are DOT project numbers, and they are real projects in the DOT 10 year plan. There has been adequate planning for some of these, but I think that is just the nature of some these department projects.

Bob Canaway: Do we want to take those first

Sam Durfee: and this list is shorter,

Alderman Jette: Sounds like we're back to individual ranking

Sam Durfee: I don't think for all of them, not to throw Tim Cummings under the bus, but some of these for Administrative Services, big round numbers these really are placeholders, they were asked to submit out-year projects, and even said as much. Something like that I'd be happy to vote in a block for all D's. Should we start with the Airport?

Marcia Wilkins: Sure, OK, and we'll go through each one.

Ranking Resumes: See attached Ranking sheet for Out-Year Projects

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by ; Seconded by . All in favor, Unanimous. Adjourned at 7:00 PM.

Scott LeClair, Chair

Date

DRAFT