

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	1
The Mission of the Capital Expenditures Committee .....	2
How to Read This Report .....	2
Capital Overview .....	3
Capital Budget .....	4
Big-Ticket Projects .....	5
The Community Preservation Act .....	7
Small-Ticket Projects.....	8
Programs .....	14
Conservation .....	14
Council on Aging.....	14
Fire .....	14
Police.....	15
Library.....	16
Public Works.....	17
Recreation .....	23
Schools.....	24
Articles .....	27
26: Appropriate The FY 2008 Community Preservation Committee Operation Budget and CPA Projects .....	27
31: Municipal Capital .....	28

# **The Mission of the Capital Expenditures Committee**

From the General By-Laws of the Town of Lexington:

*The Committee shall prior to each annual meeting for the transaction of business prepare, publish and distribute by making copies available at the Office of the Town Clerk and at Cary Memorial Library, and by mailing to each town meeting member, a report of its findings, setting forth a list of all such capital expenditures together with the committee's recommendations as to the projects that should be undertaken within the five-year period and the approximate date on which each recommended project should be started. This publication may be combined with and distributed at the same time as the Appropriation Committee Report.*

## **How to Read This Report**

Our report is divided into four sections:

- An overview of capital projects in Lexington;
- Recommended five-year capital budget;
- Spending history and general capital plan for each department and program; and
- This year's capital articles.

When we report on a capital article on Town Meeting floor, a committee member will provide commentary and the committee's recommendation. In the articles section of our report, we provide a written report on each article based on our evaluation of the issue. Our oral report on Town Meeting floor will verify our written report and present any new information not available as of this writing.

# Capital Overview

## Budget Summary

Briefly, this year's capital budget requests can be summarized as follows:

	Requests				CEC Recommended
	Tax Levy Debt	Cash	Enterprise	Roads set-aside and Ch. 90	
Recreation	\$135,000		130,000		265,000
Sidewalks	275,000				275,000
Bikeway	175,000				175,000
Roads	120,000			1,200,000	1,320,000
Building Envelope		150,000			150,000
DPW Equipment	523,300				523,300
Fire	142,000	115,000			222,000
Police	0				0
Schools	3,470,000				2,610,000
School Technology	400,000				400,000
Water, Sewer, Drains, Hydrants	460,000	25,000	3,258,500		3,743,500
CPA	1,466,199				1,054,599
Other <sup>1</sup>	450,000	142,400	133,500		725,900
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,616,499</b>	<b>432,400</b>	<b>3,522,000</b>	<b>1,200,000</b>	<b>\$11,464,299</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$50,000 requested for the NStar Parking Lot project in Lexington Center to be funded from the Parking Meter Fund.

# Capital Budget

Lexington has traditionally tried to allocate appropriate resources to needed capital projects by considering them in three categories:

- Big-ticket projects (greater than \$1,000,000);
- Small-ticket projects (between \$25,000 and \$1,000,000); and
- Enterprise projects (greater than \$25,000).

The Capital Expenditures Committee:

- Assesses capital needs brought forward by each department (municipal and schools) through the annual budgeting process;
- Works with those departments to identify their anticipated capital needs during the next five years; and
- Independently examines public facilities and prospective longer-term needs, as well as issues and capital facilities *not* being addressed within any department.

Through this report and in presentations, Capital Expenditures advises Town Meeting about the necessary and prudent investments to maintain, improve, and create new facilities required to serve Lexington citizens safely, effectively, and efficiently. During the year, committee members also work with and advise staff members in various departments, consult with other public committees, and make their views known to the Selectmen and School Committee, in an effort to shape a responsible capital budget for Lexington residents.

Please note these important caveats:

- All cost figures are *estimates*. The degree of accuracy varies by project. Those projected several years into the future are necessarily the most uncertain. They are subject to refinement as projects are designed, bid, and built. Even relatively near-term work is subject to cost uncertainties until projects are bid and contracts signed; in the current construction environment, for instance, the prices for structural steel and concrete have inflated *very* sharply in recent months.
- The scope of future projects is often highly uncertain. Accordingly, project budgets are subject to significant revision as the work is defined through the political and budgeting processes.
- Dates for appropriations and taxpayer impact of financing projects are given in fiscal years, beginning July 1.

## **Big-Ticket Projects**

Big-ticket capital projects cost at least \$1 million; for financing purposes, they satisfy the conditions under which the Town is permitted to borrow funds for at least 10 years (their expected service life is at least that long). Such projects obviously require both careful analysis and budgeting, and broad support.

The Selectmen's capital policy has generally maintained that such big-ticket projects will be funded through borrowing, consistent with their expected life and with responsible annual budgeting for operating needs. Further, the intent has been to effect such borrowing through voter-approved "debt-exclusion" overrides, which place the costs of financing these projects outside the Proposition 2 ½ tax-levy limit. The latter goal has not always been satisfied. The Town share of the costs to renovate Cary Library, for example, was absorbed within the operating budget; so were certain additional costs associated with the renovation of the secondary schools (this project was originally approved by voters in a debt-exclusion override). In each case, it was imperative to proceed within the time available for the projects to qualify for substantial state funding; accordingly, debt-exclusion overrides could not be scheduled. It is important to bear these cases in mind in thinking about major capital investments. Not every big-ticket project or element of an existing project can be subjected to a debt-exclusion vote. When they cannot, the costs are absorbed within the operating budget, with implications for Town finances.

## **The Projects Agenda**

Among the big-ticket projects Lexington is currently undertaking or may undertake in the future, we note these priorities from last year's report:

- Replacement or renovation, in whole or part, of the DPW facility (at 201 Bedford Street). Funds for this project will be requested at this Town Meeting.
- Renovation or reconstruction of the "White House". At this Town Meeting, the building will be turned over to the Board of Selectman. Its future use is uncertain at best, but given its current state of deterioration, it will need considerable attention in the near future. This may be partially funded by CPA funds.
- Renovation or replacement of the four elementary schools that have not been rebuilt (Bowman, Estabrook, Hastings, and Bridge).
- Construction of, or modification to the senior center.
- Renovation of the East Lexington Library building (possibly through CPA funding); and
- Land purchases for conservation/open space use (possibly through CPA funding).

In addition, we highlighted the importance of realistic planning for:

- The Town-owned Munroe School, currently used as the Munroe Arts Center (capital maintenance and repairs are clearly required to maintain present operations and keep the building in shape for possible alternate uses in the future).
- The original Harrington School building, after its use as swing space during the construction of the new Fiske elementary school. The building is well located and has enough room to accommodate future uses such as a senior center, while still housing the school administration since plans for renovating the “White House” have not moved forward. Such use, or adaptive reuse for other functions, will require at a minimum extensive updating of systems.

Except for the DPW Facility and the Old Harrington School, no planning has been undertaken on any of the other needs or prospective projects in the list above.

### **The Policy Setting**

Planning for and funding big-ticket projects is a multiyear process.

At the November 2006 Special Town Meeting, funding requests for additional Design and Engineering services for the DPW Facility were approved. Construction money for this project will be requested at this year’s annual Town Meeting, contingent on a Proposition 2 ½ Debt Exclusion scheduled for June.

In the past, the Commonwealth has used the School Building Assistance (SBA) program to partially reimburse municipalities for building replacements and renovations. Lexington has received funds from the SBA for the Lexington High School, Clarke, Diamond, Harrington, and Fiske school renovation/rebuilding projects. The SBA has been replaced with the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA), which will begin granting funds starting July 1, 2007. The grants will be prioritized based on various criteria, including structural soundness of the existing building, degree of existing overcrowding, prevention of loss of accreditation, and potential energy savings. The scope of work, schedule, and funding mechanisms for this program are critical factors for Lexington’s capital expenditures during the next decade since the school physical plants remain Lexington’s largest, and most intensively used, building assets.

### **Project Status and Needs**

Fiske elementary school and the neighborhood street refurbishment programs have been completed.

Whatever strategy the School Committee sets for addressing structural needs at Bowman, Estabrook, Hastings and Bridge schools, all require continuing maintenance while the longer range options are explored. An assessment by the Permanent Building Committee suggested that it might be desirable to replace Estabrook if structural issues economically preclude significant renovation on the scale required. Bowman's future needs depend in part on issues relating to the size of the school population and on redistricting. All four schools have been upgraded over time to varying degrees with new

floors, windows, HVAC and electrical systems. The full spectrum of work will have to be carefully evaluated for each school, along with needs for additional classrooms or other spaces to satisfy the educational programs. What options are chosen have obvious implications for the Town's reliance on future debt-exclusion financing versus its capacity to accommodate needed work within the tax levy under the cash-capital policy.

The Board of Selectmen's Senior Center Action Plan Committee and the Council on Aging have both done work to reevaluate and refine a location for a new Senior Center. Discussions are now focused on using the Old Harrington School or the White House. The politics of this situation are sketchy and this Committee prefers to remove itself from such discussions until a firm determination has been made by the COA and Board of Selectmen that one site or the other is most appropriate. Article 35 seeks monies to study the White House as a possible location.

Funds for a structural study of the *East Lexington branch library* are requested under the Community Preservation Act article.

While two land purchases are on the warrant this year, it is likely that they will be indefinitely postponed since the negotiations have not been completed.

The school facilities staff will be moving to the Old Harrington School in September with the school administration to follow some months later.

For all projects like these beyond the committee's five-year planning horizon, we are unable to provide even provisional cost estimates. The most recent estimates for projects about which some parameters can be provided are (for illustrative purposes only):

- \$45 million, for the *next two elementary schools* (an estimate that reflects inflation of 1% per month of some materials for recent construction).

## **The Community Preservation Act**

On March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006, Lexington voters approved the Community Preservation Act. This has imposed a 3% surcharge on property taxes; the proceeds may be used for various preservation-related capital projects, including affordable housing, conservation land, historic preservation, and recreation facilities. Funds are eligible for state matching funds, although the funds are not guaranteed. Projects are put forth by a Selectmen-appointed Community Preservation Committee and then approved by Town Meeting. As with any capital project, the Capital Expenditures Committee will give its recommendation on each of the projects put before the Town Meeting under Article 26.

The CPA certainly provides an alternative funding mechanism for capital projects. In the past, the CEC has recommended that the CPA Committee and Town Meeting only use these funds for those projects that would have been proposed anyway, whether or not CPA passed. For better or worse, this has not been the case. Several CPA funding requests this year are for lower priority projects, which under normal circumstances would not be funded. *The difficulty of the CPA is that it creates a separate pool of money*

*which can be used for a limited set of projects and can not be prioritized against the town's traditional capital needs. It is this dichotomy of funds and debate which is problematic.*

The CEC recommends that the Community Preservation Committee consider the timing of their deliberations carefully so that in the future their schedule coincides with the municipal budget cycle. This issue is covered in more detail in the Introduction of the Appropriation Report.

## **Small-Ticket Projects**

Small-ticket capital projects are funded from the tax levy and do not qualify as big-ticket projects. Generally, they cost between \$25,000 (the minimum qualification for consideration as a capital expenditure) and \$1 million, and represent projects that should be funded on a regular, timely basis to maintain Town infrastructure. Such items are easily overlooked, or subjected to funding on an “as available” basis — dangerous practices, because they invite deferred maintenance, leading small problems to turn into major deterioration and expensive repair or reconstruction. Proceeding this way also makes it impossible to plan sensible replacement policies for Town assets, even when their expected lives relative to routine use can be reasonably predicted. In this respect, we continue to work closely with the stewards of our assets to prioritize, plan and project such work for a period of five years or more.

## **The Former Cash-Capital Policy**

In reaction to the problems of financing small ticket items, in 2000 the Selectmen adopted a policy intended to establish a predictable funding source for smaller, routine capital items. This policy provided that 5% of the Town's total general fund revenue for the previous year (as estimated on the “tax rate recapitulation” or recap sheet) will be allocated each year to fund both small-ticket capital projects and debt service on existing non-exempt Town debt. Since future revenue and debt service can be predicted accurately, this policy was meant to yield a predictable funding source. Furthermore, were the Town's existing non-exempt debt repaid as then anticipated, an increasing portion of the 5% would be available to fund these small, but very important, capital projects out of cash each year.

As adopted, it was expected that most of the funds allocated for fiscal years 2001-2007 would go to repay existing debt, so a limited amount of short-term borrowing was authorized in the first few years so that critically needed projects could go forward.

The Town Manager, in consultation with the Board of Selectmen, does not believe that relying only on a cash-based capital policy is feasible for capital projects costing less than \$1,000,000. It is anticipated that the Town will continue to rely on the prudent use of debt and cash (operating revenues) to fund capital projects of this magnitude.

Under Article 28(c) of the 2006 Annual Town Meeting, which was ratified by the June 2006 Operating Override, a \$150,000 “set-aside” for “Building Envelope” was

established. This is similar to the \$500,000 operating override set-aside, in 2000, that was approved for on-going road maintenance.

The remainder of this section is included as a record of the cash capital policy and its contributions to the Stabilization Fund, lest they be forgotten when it comes time to withdraw money from the account.

In previous fiscal years, the former Cash Capital Policy's outer limits were repeatedly been made more flexible, both by more extensive borrowing within the tax-levy limit (for the Cary Library project and additional elements of the secondary-school renovation), and by the Selectmen's decision to use cash resources in other ways. In FY 2004, for example, some \$100,000 of cash capital was appropriated to balance the operating budget, and \$216,248 of additional funds were made subject to the unsuccessful operating-budget override put before voters in June 2003. In FY 2005 the Selectmen's cash capital policy would have made \$498,868 available in the fiscal year. But in order to retain cash reserves as part of the Town's larger financial-management strategy, the Town administration and Selectmen recommended that *all* small-ticket capital items be funded by borrowing (the Capital Expenditures Committee supported that recommendation). Of the cash available under the policy that year, \$224,546 was put "at-risk" in the 2004 override and since that override passed, the \$224,546 was placed in the stabilization fund.

The difference, \$274,322, was also put in the stabilization. Thus, in FY 2005, the "cash-capital" policy was drained of its cash, and for the second consecutive year, used to balance the operating budget. In effect, the policy had been turned into a sort of revolving short-term debt facility, in which repayments of prior borrowings made room for renewed current and future borrowing, in order to fund acute small ticket capital needs.

One other capital contribution has been made to the stabilization fund. In FY 2004, \$111,142 was set aside to fund approximately one-third of a new pumper truck, the balance to be paid for by a portion of the failed operating override. When the override failed, the appropriated funds remained in the reserve fund for future capital projects (funds for the truck were appropriated in FY 2005 from the tax levy.)

In FY 2006, \$83,000 was diverted from cash capital to the operating budget (Article 35) for maintenance and repairs. This transfer had the support of the Capital Expenditures Committee.

**Cash Capital Contributions to the Stabilization Fund**

FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	Total
\$111,142	\$498,868	\$0	\$0	\$610,010

In FY 2006, \$713,000 was available under the cash capital policy, and all of it was used for capital projects.

In FY 2007, \$994,939 of cash capital money was used for balancing the operating budget.

## **Recommendation Summary**

The table below summarizes the *recommendations* of the CEC (as opposed to the departmental requests) and contains all known small-ticket capital projects to be funded within the tax levy, through cash capital and debt in FY 2008. Design and planning funds for big-ticket projects are considered a part of those projects, and so are excluded here.

Descriptions of each department's small-ticket capital plans for fiscal years 2009-2012 appear beginning on page 14.

## Departmental Request Summary

The graph below shows a summary of the departmental requests for FY 2008 through FY 2012.

	2008 CEC Rec'd	2009	2010	2011	2012
		----- Town Request -----			
<b>Schools</b>					
Technology	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000
School Buildings	\$2,610,000	\$2,843,500	\$1,663,200	\$1,765,250	\$2,622,000
<b>Public Works</b>					
Equipment	\$523,300	\$591,000	\$478,300	\$615,000	\$610,000
Street Maintenance <sup>1</sup>	\$620,000	\$1,580,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
Building Envelope	\$150,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Sidewalks	\$100,000	\$200,000	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$250,000
CBD sidewalks	\$175,000	\$175,000	\$175,000	\$175,000	
Bikeways	\$175,000	\$175,000			
Storm Drainage <sup>2</sup>	\$460,000	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$175,000	\$175,000
Traffic Mitigation	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	
Hydrant Replacement <sup>3</sup>	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$50,000		
Geographic Info Systems <sup>3</sup>	\$62,400	\$52,000	\$61,500		
Lincoln Field Methane Mitig	\$400,000				
Dam Inspection	\$30,000			\$30,000	
DPW Facility	pending				
<b>Recreation</b>					
Playgrounds	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$100,000
Center Basketball Ct Recon	\$85,000				
Center Complex Restrooms		\$77,000			
Park & Playground					
Improvements <sup>4</sup>				\$150,000	
<b>Public Safety</b>					
Fire/Police Dispatch Ctr		\$295,000			
Fire Equipment	\$222,000	\$400,000			
<b>CPA<sup>5</sup></b>					
	\$1,054,599				
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$7,192,299	\$8,148,500	\$4,863,000	\$5,135,250	\$5,657,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes partial reconstruction of Woburn St

<sup>2</sup> Includes correcting Lake St drainage issues

<sup>3</sup> Total cost prorated same as FY 2008 costs

<sup>4</sup> Improvements to Adams, Franklin and Munroe

<sup>5</sup> Outyear programs are under development

## Enterprise-Fund Projects

The Town operates three enterprise funds for revenue-producing activities funded outside the tax levy by user fees (water supply, sanitary sewers, and certain recreation services, such as the golf course, swimming pools, and tennis courts; recreational playground equipment, in contrast, is not fee-generating, and capital investment for such equipment is therefore funded as part of the small-ticket program). \$100,000 per year is paid from the Recreation Enterprise Fund for Lincoln Field debt service. Unlike property-tax revenues, enterprise-fund fees are *not* subject to an arbitrary limit under Proposition 2 ½.

From a capital standpoint, enterprise-funded projects are evaluated in terms of service and cost. The water enterprise funds have been used, in part, to maintain a nearly quarter-century program of relining and replacing aging water mains; the Town benefits from clean, safe, dependable drinking water supplies, and from a minimum of disruptive breakages. The FY 2008 program includes replacing approximately 8,500 linear feet of obsolete, unlined iron pipe and other pipe with high repair records on Fern St., Moreland Ave., Hibbert St., Bennington Rd., Bowker Ave, the Bird Hill Rd. area, the access to Bowman School, and several other smaller sections of pipe townwide. Continuing with this rate of funding, suggests that there will be no unlined pipe after 2011.

For the sanitary sewer system, approximately 7,000 linear feet of infrastructure will be replaced this year in the Toffet Swamp, Moon Hill and Grant Street areas.

The only enterprise-related recreation project proposed this year is improving the Valley Tennis Court.

In future years, the Recreation Enterprise Fund will face significant spending requests for large projects at Pine Meadows golf course and the center swimming pool complex.

## Water & Sewer Enterprise Funds Recommendations

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Water Distribution</b>					
Water Distribution Piping	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000
Hydrant Replacements	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
Geographic Information System	\$102,300	\$85,300	\$100,300	\$0	\$0
	<u>\$1,927,300</u>	<u>\$1,935,300</u>	<u>\$1,950,300</u>	<u>\$1,800,000</u>	<u>\$1,800,000</u>
<b>Sanitary Sewer System</b>					
Sewage Piping	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000
Pump Station Upgrades	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Geographic Information System	\$31,200	\$26,000	\$30,600	\$0	\$0
	<u>\$1,331,200</u>	<u>\$1,326,000</u>	<u>\$1,330,600</u>	<u>\$1,300,000</u>	<u>\$1,300,000</u>
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$3,258,500</u>	<u>\$3,261,300</u>	<u>\$3,280,900</u>	<u>\$3,100,000</u>	<u>\$3,100,000</u>

### Recreation Enterprise Fund Recommendations

	2008	2009	2011	2011	2012
Valley Tennis Cts Improvements	\$130,000				
Center Complex Add'l Lights		\$310,000			
Pine Meadows Improvements			\$400,000		
Town Pool Renovations				\$300,000	
Old Reservoir Improvements					\$50,000
TOTAL	\$130,000	\$310,000	\$400,000	\$300,000	\$50,000

# Programs

## **Conservation**

Funds are now available for purchase of conservation land under the Community Preservation Act which gained voter approval in March 2006. Two parcels are under negotiation for 2007 town meeting and are listed with descriptions in the warrant. Article 27 is the Busa farm off Lowell St. abutting the Arlington Reservoir and Article 28 for a portion of land off Adams St. the so called “blueberry farm patch” near the Chiesa farm. At press time progress in negotiation suggest these may be indefinitely postponed. Conservation is actively pursuing other potential purchases. The fate of Lot 1 off of Walnut St. (47.5 acres under the control of the Mass. State Dept of Conservation and Recreation) is still uncertain, and hope remains that some or this entire parcel can be retained rather than sold to development. At least 10% of available CPA funds must be used for conservation and recreation purposes. Since the North St. sandpit transfer in 2005 no major land has been added to the conservation inventory.

## **Council on Aging**

This year under Article 35 the Senior Center is requesting the use of the \$35,000 remaining from 2000 Town Meeting for a study of the potential use of the White House for any all or part of their operation. For background: The Senior Center Action Plan Committee report of last year can be found on the town website under Social Services/COA. The sites studied, the program and the cost of developing a building that would meet the requirements of the program are detailed. The SCAPC did not consider the White House which was not available last February. The 76,000 s.f. of the site which also contains the park-like Conscience land is probably inadequate for 20,000 to 28,000 sf. building with about an acre of parking, but there is potential for a split center, the two campus concept retaining the present Muzzey location.

According to the amendment to Article 8(a) of 2000 the COA is authorized to spend \$50,000 under the following conditions. [\$15,000 has been spent developing the programmatic needs] “for site analysis and schematic drawings for a new senior center ...provided that before any site or analysis of schematic design is undertaken, the Board or Committee having custody of the site must declare its intent to release the site for this use and the COA must agree to the site so proposed.” The School Committee will relinquish the Barnes property (the White House) to the Board of Selectmen under Article 12 this year.

## **Fire**

### **Fire Department Appropriation History for Fiscal Years 2003 - 2007**

	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Fire Trucks	\$210,000		\$345,000		\$380,000
Ambulances				\$165,000	

The Fire Department uses industry standards and its own experience to establish the equipment replacement schedule. Unlike many pieces of town equipment, fire engines and ambulances are partly custom-made and equipped and require very detailed specifications, and typically a year for delivery.

The mission of the Fire Department in the twenty-first century has shifted beyond traditional firefighting to emergency services, homeland security, and community education, and our firefighters are now being trained for Emergency Services and Advanced Life Support. The equipment to perform these missions has changed with new technologies for firefighting and communications, yet the basic pumper or ladder truck or ambulance is still essential to the mission. Lexington must continue to replace its aging equipment, and retain back-up capacity.

This year the Fire Department is requesting \$80,000 to replace Engine #5 (brush truck) using general funds. This truck is used to fight off-road brush fires. The current vehicle was purchased in 1981 and has far exceeded its useful life, and is to the point that it fails to meet current safety and emission requirements. The new vehicle will be smaller, more versatile and economical. The department is also requesting \$35,000, in Article 31(j) (Building Envelope) to build a women’s shower at the Fire Station. Additionally, funds for wireless fire alarms in municipal buildings, fire hydrant replacement and Monroe Center Alarms are detailed under Article 31, sections (b), (p), and (k). See final CEC recommendations inside the front cover. Also, the money for fire monitoring equipment under Article 26(c) covering Buckman and Monroe Taverns and Hancock-Clarke House is supported by CPA funds.

The inventory of major capital equipment, date of origin, and original cost is shown below.

Description	Year	Life (yrs)	Original Cost	Est. Replacement Year
R-1 Ambulance	2002	6	\$159,050	2009
R-2 Ambulance	2006	6	\$165,000	2012
L-1 90' Aerial Ladder Truck	2000	15	\$588,000	2014
E-1 Structural	1990	13-14	\$380,000	FY 2007
E-2 Structural	2004	13-14	\$345,000	2019
E-3 Structural	1997	13-14	\$310,300	2010
E-4 Brush Fire Truck	2003	10-12	\$210,000	2015
E-5 Brush Fire Truck	1981	10-12	\$187,250	2008

## Police

Below is the Police Department five year proposed capital plan. No capital funds are requested for FY 2008.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Dispatch					
Software		\$295,000			
Space Plan <sup>1</sup>			\$100,000		
Renovation <sup>1</sup>				\$5,750,000	

<sup>1</sup> Estimated values. Projects may be delayed beyond 2010.

FY 2009 - Replace Dispatch Computer Software Network. Existing software was purchased in 1990 and is outdated and inefficient. It is recommended that this project start with an independent expert/consultant to identify a modern integrated police/fire/CAD/9-1-1 computer program. The existing hardware should accommodate a new software system with the probable addition of laser printers, scanners, and optical readers.

FY 2010 - Provide funds to study and propose an addition to the police station. The addition would add onto the police station toward the existing school administration building. The station does not have an elevator, sally port for prisoner access, bulk storage, firing range, and male/female bathrooms. The station interior is not fully ADA compliant.

FY 2011 - Provide funds to build an addition onto the police station towards the school administration building and wrapping around the existing garage facility. The design (depending on FY 2010 study) would match the three floor construction of existing structure.

## Library

### Main Library

The newly renovated main library opened in spring 2005 and has been well-received by the community. The attractive décor and furnishings have provided a welcoming environment and help blend the new with the older sections of the building. The new meeting areas are in constant use by the community. The Library Board of Trustees can now turn its attention to the East Lexington branch.

### East Lexington Branch Library

The 2005 Building Finance Advisory Committee report identified the branch as needing significant work. They recommend that the structure be evaluated by a professional engineer to study the loads imposed by the books and people in the building. They also found deficiencies in the windows, shutters, and condition of pillars and masonry, and cited the need for a new boiler, new air conditioning, and electrical system as well as insulation. The BFAC's estimate for the work is \$193,000 and did not address difficult accessibility issues. Now that the main library is finished it will be necessary for the Trustees to evaluate the future of service in this building. Its future use is limited by the terms of the Trust of Ellen Stone in 1893 for such activities as a reading room, an art

museum, a public meeting hall, a branch depository, or other suitable activity. The building is eligible for CPA funding as an “historic structure.”

The BFAC recommended an engineering study and this year under article 26(g) \$43,000 of CPA money is recommended for a study of the structural needs and potential ADA access of this historic building which is in the National Register of Historic Places.

## **Public Works**

The Department of Public Works (DPW) is the maintenance agent for all Town departments, and is responsible for the execution, i.e., design, bidding and project management of most Cash Capital projects. Currently, the Board of Selectmen and the School Committee are discussing the possibility of a single building maintenance unit. DPW will also execute Community Preservation Act funded projects. The Cash Capital funded components of DPW services include:

- Trucks and heavy equipment necessary to accomplish DPW missions,
- Structural improvements and repairs to facilities: Town buildings, Recreation facilities, e.g., methane gas containment at Lincoln Field, and a much-needed replacement of the DPW facility at 201 Bedford Street, and
- Roads, parking areas, sidewalks, sewers, water distribution, storm drainage, dam inspections.

Cash capital projects for sanitary sewers and water services, and some Recreational facilities, are adequately funded from enterprise funds; however, the rest of the capital needs, except CPA funded projects, must be funded by the general tax levy and/or debt-exclusion overrides.

## **Roads**

Lexington has a total of about 160 miles of roads, including state and unaccepted roads, including: 12 miles of major arteries, 18 miles of minor arteries, 20 miles of collector roads, 81 miles of residential thruways, and 28 miles of cul-de-sacs. Lexington’s DPW maintains about 126 miles of them, the remainder being maintained by the State or private owners.

In 2002, the voters approved a \$7,000,000 debt-exclusion override to support a goal of accomplishing necessary catch-up work to bring up the quality of all the roads within the Town's jurisdiction to a quality index level of 83 by 2007. This project has been completed, with the exception of a few streets that are having water main work completed.

To maintain the quality index of 83, approximately \$1,000,000 per year for roadwork, other than patching, is required. Of the \$1,000,00 annual spending, \$500,000 is funded from a set aside established in the 2000 operating override, while the balance is from state Chapter 90 funds. For FY 2008, Capital Expenditures is recommending a total of \$1,320,000 for reconstruction work on Woburn Street, School Street, Wood Street and Shade Street, of which \$700,000 will be Chapter 90 funds.

## **Traffic Mitigation**

Lexington owns 14 traffic signal installations and expects to add several more in future years. In FY 2008, Capital Expenditures recommends funding \$50,000 for the collection of data, the analysis of the data and the development of strategies to correct identified problems.

## **NStar Parking Lot**

In order to provide more parking places in the CBD, the BOS is requesting \$50,000 for the design and construction of approximately 30 additional parking spaces on the land behind the NStar transformer station on Massachusetts Ave. Capital Expenditures recommends approval of this request.

## **Sidewalks**

Currently the town has more than 58 miles of sidewalks. Because the upgrading and extension of many of these sidewalks was long overdue, the Board of Selectmen appointed a Sidewalk Advisory Committee in Spring 2005. Maintenance of sidewalks is expensive, and issues of obstructions, easements and objections from residents burden construction of new sidewalks. The overall policy is to develop a prioritized sidewalk construction plan focusing on school and other high pedestrian-traffic routes and high walking-hazard streets. The 2006 ATM approved \$300,000 for the FY 2007 sidewalk program. For FY 2008, the BOS is requesting \$275,000, including \$175,000 for CBD sidewalks. The Capital Expenditures Committee recommends the entire amount on the understanding that a prototype section of the CBD sidewalks will be constructed with FY 2007 Sidewalk funds.

## **Bikeway**

Since its construction in 1993, there has been relatively little maintenance of the Minuteman Bikeway. In FY 2008, DPW expects to repave and repair parts of the bikeway, approximately, at a cost of \$175,000 with an equal request to follow in FY 2009. Capital Expenditures recommends approval of this project which will reduce the risk of injury to users and prolong its useful life.

## **Geographic Information System**

A needs and cost assessment for a GIS system, funded in 2006, indicated that such a system would be extremely valuable to the Town, particularly DPW. Funding in the amount of \$195,500 in FY 2008 is recommended. The cost sharing would be: \$62,400 Tax Levy, \$31,200 Sewer Enterprise fund and \$102,300 Water Enterprise fund.

## **Water Distribution System**

Many of the Town's water mains were installed in the early 1900's. For several years the Town has been systematically improving the system to improve water quality, pressure, and fire-protection capabilities, and to reduce frequency and severity of water-main breaks. Capital expenditures recommends \$1,800,000 for the FY 2008 program, which will allow replacement of approximately 8,500 linear feet of unlined and obsolete pipe. This amount, which is funded by Water Enterprise funds, if duplicated in FY's 2009-

2011, will eliminate all unlined piping by 2011. An additional \$50,000 will be used to fund the start of a hydrant replacement program.

### **Storm Sewers and Drainage**

As streets are repaired and repaved, it is frequently discovered that the storm drainage system is seriously deteriorated. Concurrent drainage system repairs are required to prevent further deterioration of an unsafe condition and to protect newly paved secondary streets. It is also necessary, some times, to study and repair sewers where overflow conditions develop and/or complaints are received, e.g., Lake Street. For FY 2008, Capital Expenditures is recommending \$460,000, including \$40,000 for design and engineering related to the Lake Street flooding problem (this is a drainage problem, not a sewer problem).

### **Sanitary Sewer System**

The sanitary sewer system, like the water distribution, has sections that date back to the early 1900s. Due to age related deterioration, some sections are susceptible to storm water infiltration causing overloading of parts of the system. The FY 2007 program funding was used for mapping the system and determining flow characteristics and instructing DPW personnel on how to use the data to develop future programs and designs. The FY 2008 program of \$1,300,000 will correct deficiencies in the Toffet Swamp area and replace worn out valves and pump motors at several of the Town's 10 sewer pumping stations. The pipe replacement in the Toffet Swamp area will be the first phase of a multi-year program of rehabilitating approximately 7,000 linear feet of sanitary sewer per year.

### **Maintenance of the Town Buildings**

DPW has jurisdiction over 17 buildings: Town Office Building, Cary Hall, Police Station, Fire Headquarters, East Lexington Fire Station, 201 Bedford Street DPW Facility, Animal Shelter, East Lexington Library, Cary Library, Visitors Center, Council on Aging facilities, Pool Complex, Central Park Building, Reservoir Building, Westview Cemetery and Munroe Cemetery Buildings. In addition, DPW is responsible for the Town's 10 sewage lift stations. Collectively, they have an insurable value of about \$40 million and consist of about 221,000 sq. ft. of aggregate space. This requires considerable planning for preventive maintenance for roofs; heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning; plumbing; windows; exteriors; and Americans with Disabilities Act access. The FY 2008 program of \$150,000 includes a ladies' shower room at the Fire Station on Bedford Street, ADA improvements and \$40,000 for unanticipated needs during the year.

### **Dam Inspection**

Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation mandates triennial inspections of dams. The \$30,000 in the FY 2008 budget would permit inspection of the Butterfield Pond Dam and the Old Reservoir Dam. These inspections must be performed mid-2007 or the Town may be subject to fines. The Capital Expenditures Committee recommends approval of the \$30,000 request.

## **Lincoln Fields Methane Gas**

To comply with Commonwealth of Massachusetts Environmental requirements, Lexington is required to mitigate the migration of methane gases from the old landfill on Lincoln Street across Lincoln Street to existing houses. DPW has submitted a plan to DEP that involves building a slurry wall along the north side of the fields at a cost of approximately \$400,000. Capital Expenditures recommends approval of this amount, which would not be spent until receipt of the state's approval.

## **DPW Equipment**

DPW has 146 pieces of equipment, with estimated replacement cost of \$6 million. There is a well conceived program of replacing the older, less fuel efficient, more labor intensive and high maintenance cost equipment with standard off the shelf vehicles and equipment that will last longer and cost less to maintain and operate. The kind of equipment owned, operated, and maintained by DPW includes: autos, dump trucks, sanders, cranes, trailers, pick-ups, loaders, rollers, backhoes, tractor-mounted snow throwers, sweepers, brush chippers, mowers, sprayers, vacuums, compressors, welders, portable generators, pumps, lifts, and compactors. DPW has done a very commendable job of developing a long-range equipment replacement schedule that will cost around \$500,000 per year, in 2007 dollars. The rationale for FY 2008 equipment, with a total cost of \$523,300, is shown below.

## **DPW Fiscal Year 2008 Capital Equipment Replacement List**

### **# 88 1997 Elgin Sweeper, \$130,000**

#### **To be replaced with a like piece of equipment**

This sweeper is one of two and is the primary sweeper used on a daily basis from mid March through December to sweep the streets. The other is used during the spring and fall clean up, but that one is also old and will need replacement in the future. In 2005 we had to reinforce the chassis because of corrosion, the transmission is now acting up, and will need replacement, the cost of maintaining this sweeper is escalating annually. Because of the nature of what they do, sweepers are subjected to more wear and tear and tend to wear out much faster and require more maintenance than trucks. It has outlasted its useful life and needs to be replaced.

### **#131 – 1997 Toro Ground Master 580D (Parks), \$65,000**

#### **To be replaced with like piece of equipment**

This is one of our major grass maintenance machines for the Park Division. This machine is used to cut the large lawn areas at parks and athletic fields. The mower decks have been rebuilt multiple times, the hydrostatic drive is now failing, and the hydraulic system piping is rotting away from the acidic action of the grass. The engine has over 3,000 hours on it and the machine has outlived its useful life. The mower is used on a daily basis from April to November and is a key component of keeping well-groomed turf at

parks and athletic fields. Maintenance has become costly and down time reduces the efficiency of the mowing operation and leads to unsightly and unhealthy turf areas.

**#105 Small Vac-Truck, \$255,000**

**This is a new vehicle and is an addition to the fleet.**

The DPW has a need for powerful truck-mounted equipment for cleaning drainage pipes and structures. Drainage systems in town streets are operated with the permission of USEPA and Mass Department of Environmental Protection as part of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The NPDES permit requires increasingly aggressive drainage maintenance measures. All drainage structures, such as catch basins, pipes and culverts, owned by the town must be cleaned frequently. Cleaning must be done in the least disruptive way possible and the material collected in the cleaning must be disposed of properly. The material includes grit, sand, oil, grease, polluted water and trash. The most efficient way to clean structures and capture the waste material is by vacuuming with a specially configured vacuum truck. Often, high pressure flushing is required along with the vacuuming. In less-developed areas and open space, drainage flows in open channels and crosses streets in culverts. These channels and culverts are continually being blocked by trash and sediment. Blockage of channels and culverts can lead to flooding and property damage. The vacuum truck can operate from the roadway and extend the collection hose into open drainage channels to remove sediment and restore the channels their natural contours without disturbing channel vegetation. The requested vacuum truck is the standard equipment for Public Works Departments in drainage maintenance.

**#122 – 1998 Howard Price Trim Mower (Parks), \$38,300**

**To be replaced with Toro Trim Mower with Snow Package**

This is one of our major grass maintenance machines for the Park Division. This machine is used to cut the smaller lawn areas at parks and Town buildings. It supplements the large area mowers and assists in maintaining good quality turf. The engine has over 2,000 hours on it and the machine has outlived its useful life. The mower is used on a daily basis from April to November and is a key component of keeping well-groomed turf at parks and athletic fields. Maintenance has become costly and down time reduces the efficiency of the mowing operation. This machine is being replaced with a more durable Toro Trim Mower, which can more readily handle the day-to-day wear and tear of the mowing operation. In an effort to continually improve on our sidewalk plow operations this new mower will also come with a snow package, which can transform the unit into a sidewalk snow blower.

**#137 – 1980 Toro Ground Master 455D (Cemetery), \$35,000**

**To be replaced with like piece of equipment**

This is the only large area mower that the Cemetery Division uses. It is used to mow the large turf areas at Westview Cemetery. Major repairs have been necessary over the past few years with significant cost and down time, which has reduced the efficiency of this

operation and led to unsightly turf areas. Timely mowing helps to keep a more healthy and vigorous turf cover. The mower is used on a daily basis from April to November and is a key component of keeping well-groomed turf at Westview Cemetery. The engine has over 2,400 hours on it and the machine has outlived its useful life.

### DPW Facility

Design for a new DPW Facility at 201 Bedford Street was initiated with the appropriation of \$720,000 at the 2006 ATM. This amount took the architects up to the 60% Design Development (DD) point. At the November 2006 STM, an additional \$1,600,000 was appropriated so that the architects could finish DD and initiate Construction Drawings and Documents. The idea was that by 2007 ATM., the architects could provide a good cost estimate based on 50% CDs. The project has been subjected to critical review by all interested boards and committees. Capital Expenditures concurs with the appropriateness of the current program. It is noted that the new facility will allow all Public Works Divisions to be co-located. In addition, the building will provide space for a combined municipal and schools maintenance group and a designated area for an Emergency Operations Center. Capital Expenditures will defer its comments on the cost until the architects have provided a new cost estimate.

### DPW Appropriation History for Fiscal Years 2003–2007

#### Capital from the tax levy and Chapter 90 Funds

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
DPW Equipment	\$214,500	\$100,000	\$370,000	\$485,000	\$485,000
DPW Facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$720,000	\$1,300,000
Street Resurfacing(*)	\$8,100,000	\$960,000	\$1,000,000	\$960,000	\$960,000
Street Lights/Traffic Improveme	\$180,000	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$0
Landfill	\$0	\$450,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Drains & Brook Cleaning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$160,000
Town Building Envelope	\$685,000	\$240,180	\$340,000	\$150,000	\$90,000
Sidewalk Improvement	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$300,000
	\$9,179,500	\$1,750,180	\$1,810,000	\$2,465,000	\$3,295,000

(\*) \$7,000,000 in FY 2003 is from the 2002 debt exclusion

#### Capital from Enterprise Funds

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>Sewer</b>					
Sewer System	\$100,000	\$225,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$300,000
DPW Equipment	\$0	\$35,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Collection Sewers	\$0	\$0	\$600,000	\$0	\$0
<b>Water</b>					
Water Mains Relining	\$900,000	\$900,000	\$0	\$0	\$900,000
DPW Equipment	\$113,000	\$0	\$850,000	\$0	\$0
Water Mains Distribution	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Morgan Road Tanks	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Water Meters	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500,000
	\$1,113,000	\$1,160,000	\$1,600,000	\$0	\$1,700,000

## Recreation

Two recreation articles have CPA as a funding source. A drainage study of center play fields 26(a) for \$40,000 which qualifies as the preservation of an asset, and the Master Plan Engineering Study of a pedestrian walk and bikeway, the West Lexington Greenway Corridor which will provides a connector from the Paint Mine area to the Minuteman National Park path to the Cranberry Hill area utilizing public lands as much as possible. Stage 1 cost is \$125,000.

The FY 2008 capital plan for Recreation Department has utilized Enterprise Funding for capital projects since 1990. The policy is defined as “an account supported entirely by user fees associated with or generated by that enterprise for specific services that a town operates as a separate business.” The Recreation Enterprise Fund is meant to be self-sustaining: all expenses are expected to be offset by income. \$100,000 of the fund supports some of the bond for Lincoln Field and another \$100,000 of indirect charges goes to DPW largely for field maintenance. The Golf operation a major source of revenue is contracted by competitive bid and has generally been awarded to New England Golf.

Past present and future plans for recreation department show a range of projects for renewal and upgrades. Major infrastructures must be maintained, the swimming pool, the reservoir, the playground and fields, the golf course, the basketball and tennis courts all have continuing needs for upgrades and renewals and are planned in an orderly program over a five year span. The priorities may shift from year to year but the need remains.

The largest capital project on the horizon is the drainage systems and retaining walls of the cart path which divides the upper and lower ponds near the 9<sup>th</sup> green of the golf course as well as wet areas around the 4<sup>th</sup> green and the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> fairways. Hydrologist consultants have been working on a report to determine a course of action and a major project estimated around \$400,000 is planned for FY 2010. No equipment is requested for this year.

Another large expense will be the renewal of night lighting for the center baseball and basketball fields and tennis courts planned in FY 2009 for \$310,000. User fees pay for the actual time, but the fixtures are getting old and newer energy efficient lighting should replace these 1986 fixtures. It will also reduce operating and repair costs.

FY 2008 requests are for total reconstruction of the popular double center court basketball courts, Article 29(a) and the renewal of the Bowman School playfields, Article 29(b) from the tax levy. The total reconstruction of the two tennis courts at Valley Road under Article 29(c) will be financed with Enterprise Fund debt bonded over 5 years.

The renewal of neighborhood playgrounds has largely been completed except at Franklin and possibly Munroe in FY 2011 and attention has turned to the school playfields. Heavy community and school use require periodic renovation for safety and playability.

Generally renovations address turf, drainage, irrigation and amenities such as benches and backstops. The proposed schedule is Center multipurpose Playfields in FY 2009, Bridge softball and baseball in FY 2010, Hastings ball field in FY 2011, and Adams playfields in FY 2012.

The center pool was the subject of an FY 2007 engineering consultants study and a placeholder for \$300,000 is scheduled for FY 2011 pending recommendations from the final report. This facility has not had major renewal since 1980 and serves 90,000 people per summer. In addition the center restrooms need a new roof, painting, fixtures lighting and doors, planned for next year at \$77,000.

**Recreation Capital Appropriation History Fiscal Years 2003-2007**

<b>Program</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Athletic Fields	\$3,400,000				
Playgrounds & Tot Lots	\$30,000		\$35,000	\$35,000	\$225,000
Golf Course	\$30,000	\$50,000		\$50,000	\$25,000
Swimming					50,000
Tennis			\$130,000	\$30,000	
Skate Park		\$30,000	\$30,000		
	<u>\$3,460,000</u>	<u>\$80,000</u>	<u>\$195,000</u>	<u>\$115,000</u>	<u>\$300,000</u>

**Schools**

**Overview**

The Lexington Public Schools provide educational, athletic, and club activities for pre K (age 3 or more) through grade twelve to approximately 6,100 students. There are six elementary schools (K-5), two middle schools (6-8), and one senior high school (9-12). In addition there is a Central Administration Facility currently located in the center of town in the building referred to as the “White House”. The school system has assets in vehicles (maintenance trucks), furnishings, computers, and other technologies as well. Lexington Public Schools include one high school, two middle schools and six elementary schools, as well as the School Administration Building. Other assets include the furnishings, computer, and other technologies to support the school system.

**School Administration**

The school administration committee plans to vacate the current administration building (“White House”) during the summer months and to transfer system-wide administration to the old Harrington School facility which was used until February of this year to house Fiske students during the building of the new Fiske School.

Monies were appropriated at the FY 2006 Town Meeting to do a D&E study to determine cost and feasibility of renovating and expanding the White House for continued use for the central administration of the school system. Costs estimates exceeded \$4 million and the School Committee explored other options, ultimately deciding on a transition to the old Harrington at the end of this academic year. A modest amount is requested to support

the transition to and preparation of a section of the old Harrington to house central administration functions, and to secure the “White House” until a final disposition for the building is determined.

### **School Construction**

The newly constructed Fiske Elementary School has been completed and occupancy started in February 2007. Future plans for existing elementary schools are currently still under consideration by the School Committee, but plans have not yet been finalized. Enrollment trends and the physical conditions of the existing elementary schools are under consideration. There have been no recent requests for school building assistance to the Commonwealth for additional school construction.

What was formerly known as the SBAB (School Building Assistance), under the auspices of the Department of Education, has been dissolved and replaced by the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSAB) under the direction of the Office of the State Treasurer. Payments for past construction work for Harrington, Fiske, Lexington High School, and Clarke have been received. The state now studies all existing facilities and ranks them for construction or renovation based on priority needs statewide. Any future requests for new construction in Lexington would be subject to the state’s needs based criteria as well as approval by citizen vote in support of a debt exemption.

### **Maintenance**

The focus of this coming year will be to maintain the new construction and provide replacement for end of life use of older operating systems including heating, ventilation, controls, and mechanical operations of existing facilities. Working with their staff and the Capital Expenditure Committee, the School Committee has agreed to self-finance (through a reduction in their operating budget by an amount sufficient to pay the debt service) approximately 30% of the capital requests that will result in energy efficiencies. The details of the breakdown of self-financing and conventional financing appear in the article summaries of the Budget Book.

### **Energy**

The school system is making a concerted effort to identify and address those areas in school facilities that need to be replaced and/or upgraded to realize energy savings as well as improvement in the quality of air and space occupied by students and staff. In particular, attention is focused on LHS and Clarke mechanical and ventilation, insulation above ceilings at Bridge, Bowman, and Hastings, and steam traps at five schools.

### **School Technology Program**

The long-range technology capital plan is based on a systematic replacement and upgrade of network equipment, information delivery systems, desktop computers, printers/peripherals, and LCD projectors. The amount being sought for FY 2008 is the same as for FY 2007. At the current rate of \$400,000 a year it is anticipated that it will take until FY 2014 to bring the average age of school computers to less than six years.

## School Capital Appropriation History Fiscal Years 2003 – 2007

<b>Program</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Technology	185,000		290,000	270,000	400,000
Portables					
Classroom Furniture					
Miscellaneous				1,307,000	1,656,000
Secondary Schools	1,180,000	1,625,000	340,000		
Elementary Schools	32,140,000	65,000	350,000		200,000
	<u>33,505,000</u>	<u>1,690,000</u>	<u>980,000</u>	<u>1,577,000</u>	<u>2,256,000</u>

# Articles

*Traditionally this section of our report has discussed all capital articles on the warrant. This year, in an effort to save paper, the committee will only discuss the differences they have with the recommended amounts in the budget. Complete descriptions for each of the articles and items can be found in the Town Manager's budget book. A complete list of recommendations by the Capital Expenditures Committee can be found on the front and back inside cover of this report.*

## **26: Appropriate The FY 2008 Community Preservation Committee Operation Budget and CPA Projects**

**26(h): Cary Hall Improvements, Requested: \$147,130, Recommended: \$77,130**

This article requests CPA monies for the following items:

Feasibility Study, \$10,000

Blackout Curtains, \$8,000

Stage Extension and Lighting, \$59,130

Architectural Concept and Performance Studies, \$70,000

While the CEC is supportive of all four of these items, capital projects have traditionally been funded in three phases: (1) Programmatic Study, (2) Design and Engineering, and (3) Construction. The Feasibility Study (\$10,000) represents the first phase and the Architectural Concept and Performance Studies (\$70,000) represent the second phase. The article proponents have requested phase 1 and 2 monies in order to expedite the process and avoid waiting for the next town meeting before beginning phase 2. Further, they have indicated that, if appropriated, they would not begin spending phase 2 money without the approval of the Board of Selectmen. While, we have no issue with the Board of Selectmen or the article proponents, as Town Meeting's advisory committee, we recommend that Town Meeting keep their "options open" and not appropriate phase 2 money until they have seen the results of the phase 1 study. It is also important to note that CPA monies can be appropriated at any town meeting without impact to the tax levy budget. Therefore, while we are not necessarily advocating a Special Town Meeting during FY 2008, we note that the phase 2 money could be appropriated at that time should Town Meeting decide to proceed with this project.

**The Capital Expenditures Committee unanimously recommends APPROVAL of \$77,130 for Article 26(h).**

## **26(l): Muzzey Condominium Architectural Study,**

**Requested: \$53,500, Recommended: \$11,900**

The Capital Expenditures Committee recognizes the need for the proposed study as well as the approximately 20% interest in the Muzzey Condominium Association that the Town holds by way of the Senior Center and Lexhab units in the building. It also believes that since this is a request for study money, that subsequent requests will be made for construction funds using CPA monies. While the CEC is sympathetic of the issues involved with the building, it also believes that the town should only put forth its share of the monies needed for the study (20% of \$59,500). Should the Community Preservation Committee be presented with a proposal by the association for a means-based grant system whereby residents could apply for CPA monies to cover the cost of this assessment (and subsequent construction costs), this committee might view such a proposal positively.

**The Capital Expenditures Committee unanimously recommends APPROVAL OF \$11,900 for Article 26(l), contingent on a successful assessment by the association for the remainder of the funds.**

## **31: Municipal Capital**

### **31(a): Lincoln Field Methane Mitigation, Funds Unknown at Press Time**

At press time for this report, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection had reviewed the Town's proposal for methane mitigation at Lincoln Field and recommended some minor changes which might require approximately 15% more in funding.

**The Capital Expenditures Committee recommends funding the requested amount as long as it is mandated by the Commonwealth.**