

Capital Expenditure Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 5, 2016
Town Hall, 2nd Floor Conference Room

Members in attendance:

Brian Bartkus (BB), Dan Brosgol (DB), Mary Ellen Carter (MEC), Eric Dahlberg (ED), William Moonan (WM), Paul Mortenson (PM), Jim O'Neil (JO), Barbara Perry (BP)

Members not in attendance:

Tony Battaglia (TB)

Other attendees:

David Manugian – Director of Public Works; Rick Reed – Town Manager; Michael Rosen – Assistant Town Manager; Adrienne St. John – Public Works Engineer

In TB's absence, meeting was chaired by Vice Chair MEC. Meeting called to order by MEC at 7:30 PM.

1. Review and approve minutes of September 21, 2016

- a. CEC reviewed the meeting minutes of September 21, 2016, noting the following amendments:
 - In "Other attendees" on page 1, spelling of Victor Garofalo's name was corrected
 - In Section 2.e on page 1, wording of first sentence was corrected to "BP questioned whether project could be postponed and, if project were to proceed, what the annual maintenance costs would be."
 - In Section 2.f on page 2, "Board of Selectmen" was corrected to "Bedford Selectmen"
 - In Section 2.k on page 2, vote was corrected to "5-3-1"

Motion to approve the meeting minutes of September 21, 2016 made by WM; seconded by BP.
Approved by a vote of 8-0-0.

2. Proposed Department of Public Works Projects for FY18-23 Capital Projects Plan

- a. Mr. Manugian opened by acknowledging the efforts of the DPW staff in preparing the presentation and accompanying materials and by outlining the five sections of his presentation: update on existing projects; project prioritization; project questionnaires; proposed six-year capital plan; and questions.
- b. Update on existing projects: Mr. Manugian presented an overview of the ten projects that remain incomplete (referenced on slide 3 of the accompanying presentation), noting that he anticipates completing each in the next 12-15 months. WM asked if Mr. Manugian could indicate if it's the intention for each project to be completed by DPW staff or by contractor. Mr. Manugian indicated that all projects would be contracted out with three exceptions: the tree planting and wellfield cleaning projects would be completed by in-house staff; and the grounds replacement project would be completed by a combination of in-house and contracted resources.

- c. Project prioritization: Mr. Manugian presented a scatter plot chart that summarizes the priority and cost of the DPW's 55 requested capital projects (shown on slide 5 of the accompanying presentation), noting that the vast majority of projects fall under the \$500,000 cost threshold.
- d. Project questionnaires: Mr. Manugian noted that he had completed CEC project questionnaires for each of the requested capital projects – all of which were included in the binders distributed to CEC members. He stated that he would not review each questionnaire separately but offered some big picture remarks, noting that he views his job in this context as a “balancing act” since he must track the need for both capital upgrades and ongoing maintenance. He stated that it is sometimes the case that deferring capital projects isn't necessarily a bad thing as it can delay capital spending without an immediate impact on services or quality of life, pointing to the example of deferring a road repavement project for a year.
- e. Proposed six-year capital plan: Mr. Manugian kicked off a lengthy presentation on the many projects being requested, highlighting key details for each. These details were included in the accompanying presentation and binder.
- f. Questions: Mr. Manugian indicated that he would be happy to answer questions about the requested projects he had presented. MEC suggested that the CEC go down the list of projects as presented to keep discussion organized.
 - i. BB asked about the status of athletic field construction, specifically of the Liljegren field work since he had understood that this piece would be completed first. Mr. Manugian indicated that design is currently wrapping up. Ms. St. John indicated that construction should begin in the Spring of 2017, with completion anticipated for the Summer of 2017.
 - ii. BB asked for more information on the boat landing dock replacement project, specifically on how many people use the dock currently. Ms. St. John responded that it is used quite frequently. BB offered the additional thought that perhaps the Town of Carlisle may be willing to consider chipping in for the cost of the project.
 - iii. MEC asked how many plots are left at the cemetery – in the context of the cemetery expansion study project. Ms. St. John responded that latest estimates are that there is space for roughly 300 graves remaining.
 - iv. BP asked if it is possible that the state will ultimately reject the Davis Road boardwalk project. Ms. St. John responded that this is a possibility, but that the town's plan is to proceed with design and permitting and then go to the state for approval.
 - v. WM asked if there are anticipated future requests for additional work at Fawn Lake – in the context of the Fawn Lake Improvements project. Ms. St. John stated that the current plan is to build a bio-retention basin that will draw off nitrogen before it reaches the Lake, noting that this project has an expected life of 50 years. Mr. Reed added that this project is eligible for community preservation funding.
 - vi. JO noted that he would like to see a more active tree replacement program – in the context of the Jenks Trail project.
 - vii. DB asked for clarification on the Middlesex Turnpike Water Main Replacement project. Mr. Reed explained that the bigger project is a \$35M state/federal infrastructure improvement project that Bedford would like to “piggyback” on while the road is dug up, stressing that timing critical for a FY 2018 completion.

- viii. WM asked if the aerial photography for the “Planimetrics” project has already been done. Ms. St. John responded that it has already been done, but it may need to be repeated if the results are not of sufficient resolution.
- ix. MEC asked if the \$1.5M figure for road resurfacing includes Chapter 90 funding from the state. Mr. Reed indicated that it does.
- x. JO stated that he hopes the school fencing project includes repair/replacement of both the chain link fencing itself and the wooden guard rails. He would also like to see support bars across the top of entry gates and properly adjusted hinges.
- xi. BB asked for clarification on the sewer force main replacement project. Ms. St. John responded that this project is intended to fund recommendations that come out of last year’s study.
- xii. BB asked for comment on the viability of Spring Brook Park. Mr. Reed states that it is an important town resource and that the biggest issue he sees is around the clarity of the water. JO suggested that the DPW consider renting a truck equipped with a mobile sand filtration system to help improve the water clarity.
- xiii. BB asked for clarification on the town common walkway project. Ms. St. John explained that this is the walkway that bisects the town common (the location of the annual prom stroll). WM suggested that Ms. St. John keep in touch with the Historic District Commission on this project.
- xiv. DB asked if Babe Ruth baseball may be willing to consider pitching in for the town/school recreational grounds rehabilitation project (specifically the Page Field piece). Ms. St. John responded that she did not know. DB added that Babe Ruth baseball may have money at its disposal for such a purpose, so it may be worth reaching out to them.
- xv. JO stated that, regarding the water meter replacement project, he would like to see reports on town water and sewer use. Mr. Reed responded that he is not able to produce such a report based solely on the request of a single CEC member but is interested to understand if the CEC as a body would like to make a similar request. He clarified that most of the town’s water and sewer costs fall into the operating budget and that it is the Bedford Selectmen who consider and set the rates, not the CEC.
- xvi. WM asked for clarification on the water tank refurbishment project. Ms. St. John indicated that this project would entail painting the interior of all three water tanks, with an anticipated life of 15 years.

3. New Business

- a. In anticipation of future meetings, Mr. Rosen asked CEC members to indicate their preference for format of meeting materials – electronic or physical binders. Four members indicated a preference for physical binders. Mr. Rosen noted that he would prepare those and bring them to meetings as warranted going forward.
- b. Mr. Rosen noted that CPC will request only three projects for FY18 and questioned whether a joint CEC/CPC meeting was warranted, as had been previously discussed at past CEC meetings. Consensus of the CEC was that such a joint meeting is no longer necessary.

4. Next Meeting Dates

N/A – note that agenda for October 5th meeting included anticipated future meeting dates.

5. Adjournment

- a. Motion to adjourn made by BB; seconded by ED. Approved by a vote of 8-0-0.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Eric Dahlberg, CEC Clerk.

Minutes approved as amended on October 12, 2016