

Capital Expenditure Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, November 7, 2018, 7:00 PM
Town Hall, Second Floor Conference Room

Members in attendance:

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

Members not in attendance:

- Tony Battaglia (TB)
- William Moonan (WM)

Other attendees:

- Karen Dunn- Finance Committee
- Carl Gagnon- Department of Public Works
- Amy Hamilton
- David Manugian- Department of Public Works
- Heidi Porter- Board of Health
- Rajitha Purimetla- Department of Public Works
- Michael Rosen (MR)- Assistant Town Manager

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

1. Bedford Board of Health FY 2020 Capital Project Review

- a. Ms. Porter provided the CEC with the following overview of the bus shelter project for the Town:
 - i. There are 21-bus stops in the Town. Only 2-bus stops currently have a shelter for the riders; both are located at the VA hospital. The VA installed the shelters on their property at their own cost.
 - ii. The MBTA is responsible for the buses and bus routes: they are not responsible for bus shelters. The Town is responsible for providing shelters at bus stops.
 - iii. The Selectmen support the concept of bus shelters and have suggested that the BOH find funding through private donations.
 - iv. The BOH has met with the Economic Development Director for the Town, Alyssa Sandoval concerning funding opportunities for the project. Ms. Sandoval suggested that a gift account should be created to assist in soliciting funds from retailers, employers, and supporters of public transportation. To date, approximately \$5k has been loosely pledged in support of the concept.
 - v. The BOH has conducted research to determine which of the sites has the most ridership usage. Based on these findings the BOH has recommended that the Town provide shelters at 3-locations: on Town Common (on the north side of South Road), on Loomis St. across from the CVS store, and in front of the Chipotle restaurant at the Stop & Shop Plaza on the Great Road.

- vi. The BOH is looking to have committed resources to fund the project in FY20. The funding for the project would reside within the DPW Capital Plan.
- vii. A 4th shelter is also being proposed for the Town with the funding for that shelter coming from the gift account. The shelter would be located on South Rd. at Railroad Ave.

Questions and Responses

1. ED asked what the cost was for each shelter?

Ms. Porter stated that the cost for each shelter would be \$11.6k, assuming that the construction would be done by the DPW.

ED asked if corporate sponsorships were looked into to fund the shelters?

Ms. Porter answered that they would not be seeking sponsorships based on the advice of the Selectman and various other groups. The possibility of issues arising with signage and advertisements that might not be consistent with what Bedford stands for was the main reason given for not pursuing this opportunity.

ED asked if these shelters would be on sidewalks or would they be set back?

Ms. Porter responded that the shelter near the Town Common would need to be set back from the sidewalk onto the Common. The Stop & Shop Plaza land would require the Town to purchase the land from its current owner, and the Town already has a right-of-way for the Loomis St. shelter.

2. BB asked what was the total cost for the project?

Ms. Porter said that the costs for the 3-shelters would be \$34.7k.

BB asked who would be responsible for maintenance for the shelters, specifically regarding snow removal.

Ms. Porter stated that the maintenance of the shelters would fall to the DPW.

Mr. Manugian said that the DPW is looking to add individuals to shovel snow in 2018, and going forward. These individuals could be made up of existing union employees or contract staff. Part of their responsibility would be to maintain the 3-shelters.

3. JC asked if it was the BOH's intention to eventually have a shelter at each of the 21 current bus stops?

Ms. Porter responded that the plan is to continue to identify the next busiest bus stops and to include a request for shelters for those stops as part of the DPW's Capital Plan. Ms. Porter stated that not all bus stops are well utilized and therefore may not warrant a shelter or even a stop. The BOH has not performed the analysis on this issue as of this date.

4. BP asked if the bus stops were currently maintained by the Town?

Ms. Porter answered that they are not currently maintained. However, they would be going forward under this program.

5. SS asked if the DPW has the resources to undertake this project in FY20 given the backlog of projects from previous years?

Mr. Manugian stated that the project could be completed in FY20 but that other projects would have to be moved down on the priority list to do so.

SS stated that he was opposed to approving any project that taxed the citizens of Bedford now but will not be completed for 2-3 years.

MEC suggested that the DPW tell the CEC how many shelters could be completed in FY20 and how many could be completed in subsequent years. The CEC could then approve the appropriate amount of funding to complete those projects in each year.

6. MEC asked if the Historic District Commission has given approval for the proposed shelter on the Town Common.

Ms. Porter responded that the Historic District Commission is in talks with the BOH on this issue.

MEC noted that all of the proposed shelters are outbound shelters. The question was asked if any consideration has been given to provide shelters at inbound bus stops as well?

Ms. Porter responded that there could be inbound shelters in the future but that current efforts have been to identify the busiest stops to this point. The 3 busiest bus stops happened to be outbound stops.

2. Department of Public Works: FY 2020 Vehicle Capital Projects Review

- a. Mr. Manugian provided an explanation of the 3-step process for reviewing vehicles for replacement. The process is as follows:
 - i. The DPW performs a "first-pass" review of all the vehicles in the Department to determine their condition. The areas that are reviewed for each of the 70-vehicles are the year of the vehicle, the mileage, the hours of usage, and the

overall condition. Based on these criteria, 25-vehicles were flagged for consideration.

- ii. The VFA software is then reviewed for each vehicle to determine which vehicles have met or exceeded their useful life: ten vehicles were flagged for consideration.
- iii. A final physical inspection is performed on the vehicles. Additionally, each vehicle's maintenance record is reviewed in conjunction with the inspection. From this final review, 8-vehicles were selected for replacement.
- iv. In total 9-vehicles are being recommended for replacement including the 8-vehicles vetted from the process above and one additional large vehicle.
- v. Of the 9-vehicles, 6-vehicles are in the Vehicle and Replacement category (\$296.1k) and 3-vehicles are in the Large Equipment Replacement category (\$499.9k).
- vi. The Large Equipment Replacement category requests are:
 1. Replace the *mechanical street sweeper* purchased in 2010 with a vacuum street sweeper for \$230k (purchase price of \$250k with an estimated \$20k trade-in for the current sweeper.) The current sweeper is in good condition and has incurred minimal maintenance requirements to date. The thought is that the Town would benefit by trading the vehicle now when the value of the vehicle is higher. Additionally, the vacuum sweeper provides more utility for the Town as it has the ability to sweep up leaves: the vacuum sweeper compresses the leaves and stores them in a large hopper. The added functionality and capacity would eliminate the need for a second individual and truck to assist in the transport of the debris thus providing increased efficiency and cost savings to the Town.
 2. Replace the *16-foot large field mower* for \$120k. The current mower was purchased in 2011 and is nearing the end of its useful life. The mower is a front-line piece of equipment that is used from early spring to late fall and is beginning to show considerable wear and tear from usage. The desire is to make sure the vehicle is on a regular replacement rotation schedule in order to minimize downtime and maintenance costs.
 3. Replace the *payloader* purchased in 2001 for \$130k. The loader is a multi-season, multi-purpose vehicle that has reached the end of its useful life.

Questions and Responses

1. BB asked if the current street sweeper could be used as a backup in the future?

Mr. Gagnon responded that while it could be used as a backup, the fact that it can't pick up leaves will still exist and that is one of the main reasons for requesting the vacuum sweeper.

BB asked if there is any trade-in value for the large mower?

Mr. Gagnon stated that there absolutely could be some trade-in value. However, as time passes the trade-in value of a high-use/high-maintenance vehicle like the large mower will be significantly reduced.

BB asked that one of the vehicles being replaced was a 2009 Toyota Prius with a Chevy Canyon pick-up truck. Would this result in the loss of a green-vehicle for the Town?

Mr. Gagnon said that the pick-up truck is classified as a green-vehicle. Additionally, the replacement of the Ford Taurus with the Ford Escape will result in the addition of a green vehicle for the Town as the Escape qualifies as a green-vehicle as well.

2. JC asked if the benefits of utilizing an aggressive chemical product to salt the Town's roads was resulting in excessive corrosion in many of the vehicles being replaced?

Mr. Gagnon agreed that exposure to the chemical is the main cause of the corrosion, but there is no way to maintain the streets at the desired level of safety without using this type of chemical. Mr. Gagnon stated that the DPW tries to be mindful of this issue by applying the chemical in moderation and by thoroughly washing the vehicles after each storm.

3. JS stated that it sounds like the vacuum sweeper is a more complicated vehicle: will this have an impact on the life of the sweeper and does this mean that the cost of maintenance will be higher?

Mr. Gagnon responded that the sweeper is neither more or less complicated than the mechanical sweeper- it's just a different type of vehicle system.

4. MEC asked if the large vehicle acquisitions were being bonded?

Mr. Rosen answered that they were all being bonded.

MEC asked if renting a sweeper had been considered since the vehicle is only used 25 days (app.) a year?

Mr. Gagnon answered that the sweeper is used more than just during the Spring/ early Summer clean-up. The vehicle is used for various special Town events like Bedford Day and for unplanned instances such as accidents.

Mr. Manugian said that the Town had casually looked at sharing a sweeper with another Town but the problem is that every Town uses their sweepers at the same time of the year. Likewise, the same

problem would exist if the rental option was chosen; contending with other Towns during peak usage periods.

MEC asked if the shelter project could be amended to reflect the number of shelters that could more representatively be completed by the DPW in FY20 and beyond. This would help to avoid funding the project and then not completing the project in the year the citizens were taxed. The goal should be to not fund projects that will only add to the backlog of projects that already exist.

Mr. Manugian said that this is the very same conversation that was had concerning the pickleball project and that, in both instances, the questions are appropriate and should be asked. The DPW will look to address this concern.

MEC stated that the Springs Brook water filtration project appears to be an operating expense as opposed to a capital expense. Should it be included in the DPW's Operation's budget going forward?

Mr. Manugian responded that the 3-year request for the filter program is to help determine if the Town should spend \$1.4m on a more permanent solution. The data provided from last year's usage of the filter was not conclusive. Expanding the study over the next several years should help to provide the detail necessary to make the greater capital expenditure decision. The expense should, therefore, be included in the capital plan.

5. JC said that the Town of Littleton had recently (2016) undertaken a study to dredge a pond similar in size and condition to Fawn Lake. Littleton partnered with the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers to do the study. The Army paid for 65% of the study and will pay the same amount to complete the project as the as it was approved by the citizenry. JC asked if at any point in time in the process was a similar option considered for Bedford. If available to Bedford, the 65% shared cost for the \$1.8m project would result in a tax savings of more than \$1m.

Mr. Manugian stated that the Town had not considered this option but would be willing to reach out to the Town of Littleton to discuss how they went through the process.

6. BP asked when does the DPW begin to start the process of mapping out staffing requirements and scheduling for maintenance projects? Does the DPW start planning staff requirements as the projects are approved as opposed to when they begin or are completed? BP recommended that having a plan would better predict staffing levels and requirement needs as part of the capital planning process.

Mr. Manugian responded that maintenance programs are not scheduled in advance but as they occur or are identified. Once the

need has been identified the projects are then prioritized and completed according to need.

3. Review and approve minutes

Motion to approve the meeting minutes of October 10, 2018 was made by SS. Seconded by BP. Approved by a vote of 5-0-2.

Motion to approve the meeting minutes of October 17, 2018, as amended, was made by SS. Seconded by BB. Approved by a vote of 7-0-0.

4. New Business

The CEC agreed to reschedule the meeting of December 12th to Monday, November 19th at 6:30 PM.

5. Next Meeting Dates

Next scheduled meeting dates: **November** 19th, 28th; **December** 5th.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn made by SS and seconded by Ed. Approved by a vote of 7-0-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted by John F. Carbone, Clerk.

