

**Capital Expenditure Committee**  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, December 5, 2018, 7:00 PM  
Town Hall, Second Floor Conference Room

Members in attendance:

- Brian Bartkus (BB)
- Tony Battaglia (TB)
- John Carbone (JC)
- Mary Ellen Carter (MEC)
- Eric Dahlberg (ED)
- William Moonan (WM)
- Barbara Perry (BP)
- JoAnn Santiago (JS)
- Stephen Steele (SS)

Members not in attendance:

- None

Other attendees:

- Daniel Brosgol- School Committee
- David Coehlo- School Department
- Donna Clements- School Department
- Michael Rosen (MR)- Assistant Town Manager
- Sarah Stanton- Town Manager

TB called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM, noting that a quorum was present.

**1. Review and approve minutes**

**Motion:** To approve the meeting minutes of October 24, 2018, as amended, was made by BB. Seconded by SS. Approved by a vote of 7-0-2.

**Motion:** To approve the meeting minutes of November 7, 2018, as amended, was made by BB. Seconded by SS. Approved by a vote of 7-0-2.

**Motion:** To approve the meeting minutes of November 19, 2018, as presented, was made by BB. Seconded by SS. Approved by a vote of 7-0-2.

**2. Discussion of FY20 IT Capital Project Spend (\$524.8k) for School Department**

- a. Ms. Clements provided the CEC with an overview of the technology utilized throughout the schools. The presentation included:
  - i. A discussion of the Department of Education's requirements for Massachusetts schools.
  - ii. Examples of daily uses of technology from selected grade levels and students.
  - iii. A discussion of IT uses in specialty classes.

**Questions and Responses**

1. JS asked if items are replaced during the summer or can items be replaced during the school year without disruption?

Ms. Clements stated that most replacements are scheduled for school vacation periods as technicians are working during these periods. Replacements that require immediate attention can be done while classes are in session without disruption.

2. SS asked if the State provides standards for the number of devices required per student? Second, what are the standards for devices per student for the District?

Ms. Clements stated that the State does provide standards for the number of devices per student, as well as, personnel and infrastructure requirements. Those numbers will be provided to the CEC.

3. BP asked if the use of the various technology platforms successfully provided students with the basic needs for education in a public school from elementary to the high school level?

Ms. Clements stressed that technology supplements the education that the teachers provide: technology does not replace the role that teachers play. Technology builds higher-end critical thinking/high-order skills that reinforce the basic skill requirements for students. Technology also addresses the needs that the State has determined as necessary for students to be successful.

4. JC requested that an inventory map be provided for future years to help the CEC understand more fully the needs of the Department, as well as, the costs associated with those needs. The detail presented for FY20 did not provide clarity concerning the current IT inventory level; the replacement timeline for that inventory; and the estimated cost of replacement.

5. BB stated that the IT Capital plan should be part of the School Department's Operating Budget. The use of technology is integral and critical to the education process. The technology decision should reside with educators who are more aware of the needs of the students and more qualified to make the decisions necessary to meet those needs.

6. ED asked if printer usage has decreased and, as a result, has the cost of printing come down with the decrease in usage?

Mr. Coehlo responded that usage is not tracked for printing. However, the amount of paper purchased on an annual basis for the high school is 13-18% (app.) lower than in previous years. Additionally, the School Department's purchase of toner cartridges



for printers is lower. Based on these observations one could conclude that print usage has decreased.

ED asked if we could see the day when the School's would go paperless?

Mr. Coehlo stated that the current goal is to continue to use less paper. The immediacy of actually addressing a paperless environment would require significant changes to the culture of the Department and would be much further out on the time horizon.

7. MEC stated that it would be useful to see benchmarking data from other Districts or from the State to help understand where the Town is relative to other school's regarding student-device allocation standards.
8. TB suggested that the School Department should consider developing a technology plan similar to the recommendation made for a Town-wide technology plan. The plan could be a 3-year plan instead of a 6-year plan due to the rapid change in technology costs and capabilities.

TB recommended that certain technology requests remain in the Capital Plan. Infrastructure equipment, servers, switches, and major software applications should remain in the Capital Plan. Items such as laptops, desktops, Chromebooks, and printers would be accounted for in the School's Operating Budget because of their short lifecycle.

SS suggested that the determination as to what is a Capital as opposed to Operating item may be an issue for the Financial Planning & Coordinating Committee to consider.

9. BP proposed that the Department's capital requests be broken-out into various categories in the same fashion as the Large Vehicle section of the DPW's Plan. This would allow the CEC to separately evaluate requests, according to each category. This would also avoid the potential that the entire IT request could be denied in the event that one or more items were not recommended for approval.

Mr. Coehlo said that the ability to report requests within categories already exists for each project. The information can be formatted in the future to meet the needs of the CEC.

### 3. CapEx Recommendations

**Motion:** To remove the Springs Brook Park Water Clarity Filtration System request (\$80k) from the FY20 Capital Plan was made by MEC. Seconded by SS. Approved by a vote of 6-0-2.

**Motion:** To recommend to the Bedford Selectman the FY20 capital project list as finalized at the Capital Expenditures Committee's December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting was made by BB. Seconded by JC. Approved by a vote of 9-0-0.

**4. New Business**

BB asked for a status update on the Springs Brook Park project.

Ms. Stanton stated that the Selectman are comfortable with the proposal and the ask and will be going before the Finance Committee in two weeks to present the plan. The Recreation Department is comfortable with the proposal as well. The meeting and the outcome were positive.

**5. Next Meeting Dates**

Next scheduled meeting dates: **January** 23rd and **February** 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

**6. Adjournment**

**Motion:** To adjourn the meeting was made by WM. Seconded by MEC. Approved by a vote of 9-0-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted by John F. Carbone, Clerk.

