

Bedford – Capital Expenditures Committee Minutes

Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2014 in the Town Hall 2nd Floor Conference Room

Capital Expenditure Committee (CEC) Attendees: Jon O'Connor (OC), Jim O'Neil (JO), Barbara Perry (BP), Abbie Seibert (AS), Jean-Marc Slak (JM), William Moonan (WM), Tony Battaglia (TB) and Karen Dunn

Absences: Brian Barktkus

Other Attendees: Jessica Porter (JP) - Assistant Town Manager , Taissir Alani (TA)- Facilities, Victor Garofalo (VG) – Finance Director/Treasurer, Chief Robert Bongiorno (RB) , Lt. Jim Graham, Sgt. Richard Vitale, Sgt. Pat Towle (PT), Margot Fleischman, and Marsha Pyles – Facilities,

Meeting called to order by OC at 7:30

RB introduced the police officers with him and that Sgt. Towle (PT) would demonstrate the Taser technologies the Bedford Police Department are considering and the one they are recommending.

PT described the successful use in and the background of the products offered by Taser Int'l. PT discussed the "less than lethal" version of Tasers has been in use and approved by the state since 2004. A key basis for use is that the officer is safe and the person being pursued has a greater chance of not having to be apprehended via the use of a weapon or physical force. There were versions of Taser guns under consideration. The one recommended has a 21 foot coil launched probe with a fish hook at the end of the coils that make the victim's muscles contract for 5 minutes such that the officer can apprehend the victim. Have EMT's perform a health safety check on the victim and decide on whether medical care is required or bring the perpetrator in for processing.

PT then described an incident in which the Bedford police were involved in an altercation on Springs Brook Road where the officer could have used a Taser without the high level of interactions that were required that evening. PT then addressed what is considered the levels of what is considered less than lethal taser. PT & RG described various forms of interactions that the law enforcement officers are confronted with and how various forms of protection and apprehension of the perpetrator are utilized. Sgt.-Vitale. described how the use of pepper spray can be utilized. The officers all outlined various forms of options that they are faced with in confrontations with perpetrators before the use of a firearm would need to be deployed. JO inquired as to the effect of a Taser on a pacemaker or if the person is prone to seizures. PT did not know but said he would check w/ Taser Int'l. He did mention that the Taser was less likely to cause permanent damage versus other forms of force. RB stated that the officers need tools to do their job necessary as well as protect them in these types of occurrences. He also discussed that the Police Department may receive a DOJ grant funding for this expenditure. He felt it was important to bring this type of technology to the attention of the Town even if it was funded through a non-Bedford funded source. RG described how with the purchase of their Tasers the department would have to develop policies around the use of the technology. In addition, all of the officers would have to be trained and be certified in the use of the technology. LT. Graham brought up that there has never been a death as a result from Taser. There may have been a circumstance where a condition like drugs involved causing the victims death but not directly related to the Taser. RB & PT

went through the cost make up and that there would be 34 units purchased which includes spare devices. The officers would have to be recertified every year. PT mentioned that the most critical part of the use of the Taser is effective training as well as how the user understands the effects/utilization of the technology. There is a camera option with the Taser which they are recommending at a cost of \$540 per unit. The camera captures info that takes place during the altercation. The total cost with all units outfitted with video would cost \$54K. Without the video option, the cost would be \$35K. JM inquired how the officer would carry the Taser. PT described that it would be a side hip holster. JM asked if the officer would be crowded in their vehicle. PT described how they are already crowded in the cruiser but the SUV vehicles, which the department is beginning to transition to, would create a little more room. RG closed with stating that perpetrators have become more compliant with the use of Tasers. Effective training and the use of verbal warnings all contribute to better safety for the officers and even the victims. RB desires to get a community based decision. RB would perform a town education of the technology for greater acceptance of the use of this technology by the department. Trusting the officer is knowledgeable over the use of the technology is very important. Several of the nearby towns have them. It comes down to proper training on a repetitive basis.

WM inquired about the Fingerprint system. Lt. Graham stated it is a 12 year old system. The system is very inconsistent in transmitting the finger print. The maintenance cost has increased as well. RB discussed how the system is used every time an arrest is made. The officer has to obtain the finger ridges to complete a proper finger print. However, at times the system is unable to perform this part of the process due to its age and technology. In addition, once a proper fingerprint is obtained you can receive quick notification of the person being fingerprinted. The officer is less likely to get matches of partial prints. OC inquired if the proposed system is compliant with new FBI requirements. RG stated that it is. The new system is around \$12K which can be recovered from the reduction of maintenance cost of the old system in the matter of 2 years. In addition, the new system will work with the new version of tablets the department is currently inspecting. This would allow for even faster turnaround of the fingerprint.

Before the officers left the CEC meeting they demonstrated the use of Tasers on a human foil mock up.

TA followed up with CEC over the outstanding questions related to the MEP project, Article 13, from the last MEP presentation. TA described how certain activities such as the HVAC will have to be performed in the Multipurpose Room (MP) where a hole will be made in the MP for the HVAC system to be replaced. JO asked why there is a cost that relates to HVAC, but cannot be taken out of the project related to the multipurpose room. Instead of making the hole, why a side ramp entrance be made instead. TA responded that it is not worth doing that since a hole would not be required again for 20 or 30 years. BP inquired over why the MP \$300K line item cannot further detailed. TA responded that there are multiple line items such as making the hole in the floor for the HVAC and the sprinkler system where they would have to be performed whether the MP was renovated or not. It would take an extensive effort to calculate all of the line items to back out what must be performed versus what is optional to perform. WM felt there should be at least a hard number – amount to be spent in the MP for the CEC to decide. TA stated the pricing was performed as a whole for the work efforts and it would be difficult to calculate. MF guesses it could be upwards of \$100K to \$150K. WM inquired that if the number is an approximate number and that is the best we can get. TA explained that there are the steps, rails, painting, sprinklers, fire alarm system, the hole in the floor and its repair. Also, it would be

best to do the air handler system because it would conflict against the new system. JO asked about the elevator. TA stated the elevator could go 1 or 2 years w/o issue but there will be problems like there have been even recently where someone was stuck in the elevator. The controls are 20 years old. The proposal is to replace the controls and minor facing update. RR discussed that the bids were all separately advertised. It made sense to place the work efforts under separate contracts and was easier to administer. WM inquired as to what are the sources of the numbers? TA described the numbers are from his estimates, those of contractors, reference materials and from other contractors people who are familiar with the work effort. RR stated that the pricing does not include potential rebates that the MEP might qualify for. RR also stated that the MP could be used more often due to the renovations.

There was then a discussion between the CEC, RR and VG over where the current capital plan stands with regards to being shared with other committees. Also, a discussion over how CEC should select what projects to approve. WM felt a ranking of the projects should be done. RR stated that he does not expect the capital plan to be approved in its entirety. JM felt that there should be some formal vote of the projects. JO felt that some projects should be removed because of their lack of merit. RR described how the 6 year plan will assist in moving projects along such that the CEC would be familiar with those projects future out in years and that it would be easier to review them when the time comes for approval in that respective fiscal year. That is the objective of the 6 year plan. RR felt that by the time you get to discuss the plan the committee would have addressed it numerous times. Many of the local communities, such as Arlington, perform this process and it has worked well.

OC asked for the CEC to address their comments related to the MP. Several members felt the information provided was not thorough and required more detail, especially with the MP. Several others voiced their comments over how the project should move forward. OC placed a vote into motion where the vote was split 4 yeah and 4 nays. The CEC will address the Article in a future meeting.

Adjourned at 10:45pm

Prepared by

Tony Battaglia

Minutes approved on October 29, 2014