

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE

TOWN OF LEXINGTON



REPORT TO THE 2011 ANNUAL TOWN MEETING

Released March 17, 2011

Submitted by:

Charles Lamb, Chairman
Ted Edson, Vice-Chairman
William Hurley
David G. Kanter
Shirley Stolz

Summary of Warrant Article Recommendations

Abbreviations: RF = Revolving Fund; CPF = Community Preservation Fund;

EF = Enterprise Fund; RE = Retained Earnings; GF = General Fund;

SF = Stabilization Fund; TBD = To Be Determined; ATM = Annual Town Meeting

Art.	Description	Request	CEC Recommended	Funding Source
7	Establish and Continue Departmental RFs			
7(3rd)(a)	Culvert Replacement	\$65,000	\$65,000	DPW Compost Operations RF (Cash)
7(3rd)(b)	Compost Facility Green Waste Study (Anaerobic Facility Study)	\$52,000	\$52,000	DPW Compost Operations RF (Cash)
8	Community Preservation Committee Operating Budget and CPA Projects			
8(a)	Archives & Records Management/Conservation	\$150,000	\$150,000	CPF (Cash)
8(b)	East Lexington Fire Equipment Doors Replacement	\$60,000	\$60,000	CPF (Cash)
8(c)	Leary Property Planning Funds	\$30,000	\$0	CPF (Cash)
8(d)	LexHAB—Set Aside for Housing Acquisition	\$450,000	\$450,000	CPF (Cash)
8(e)	Battle Green Monument Restoration	\$50,000	\$50,000	CPF (Cash)
8(f)	Battle Green Master Plan Implementation	\$50,000	\$50,000	CPF (Cash)
8(g)	Center Playfields Drainage – Phase II	\$911,863	\$911,863	CPF (Cash)
8(h)	Muzzey High Condo Association—Window Replacement	\$0	\$0	Withdrawn by applicant, March 15, 2011
8(i)	Vynebrooke Village Drainage Improvements	\$364,800	\$364,800	CPF (Cash)
8(j)	Busa Farm Debt Service	\$974,600	\$974,600	\$757,715 CPF (Cash) + \$216,885 GF (Free Cash)
8(k)	Cotton Farm Debt Service	\$1,300,604	\$1,300,604	CPF (Cash)
8(l)	Administrative Budget	\$150,000	\$150,000	CPF (Cash)
9	Recreation Capital Projects—Town Pool Renovations	\$165,000	\$165,000	Recreation EF (RE)
10	Municipal Capital Projects & Equipment			
10(a)	Dam Repair—Phase I	\$270,000	\$270,000	GF (Debt)
10(b)	DPW Equipment	\$485,100	\$485,100	\$365,000 GF (Debt) + \$120,100 Water EF (RE)
10(c)	Storm Drainage Improvements	\$500,000	\$500,000	GF (Debt)
10(d)	Sidewalk Improvements and Easements	\$200,000	\$200,000	GF (Debt)
10(e)	Replacement of Ambulance	\$240,000	\$240,000	GF (Debt)
10(f)	MIS Technology Improvement Program	\$165,000	\$165,000	GF (Debt)
10(g)	Townwide Electronic Document Management System	\$410,000	\$410,000	GF (Debt)
10(h)	Hydrant Replacement Project	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$25,000 GF (Cash) + \$25,000 Water EF (RE)
10(i)	South Lexington Transportation Master Plan	\$125,000	\$125,000	Traffic Mitigation SF
10(j)	Street Improvements and Easements	\$846,602	\$846,602	\$500,000 GF (Cash, FY2001 Override Set-aside) + \$65,368 GF (Cash) + \$281,234 GF (Cash) [also \$700,000 Chapter 90 State Aid for a total of \$1,546,602]
10(k)	Westview Cemetery Irrigation – Phase III	\$35,000	\$35,000	GF (Free Cash)
10(l)	Comprehensive Watershed Stormwater Management	\$50,000	\$50,000	GF (Free Cash)
10(m)	Townwide Signalization Improvement	\$42,000	\$42,000	GF (Free Cash)
10(n)	Waltham Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements	\$66,000	\$66,000	Traffic Mitigation SF
10(o)	Park Improvements – Athletic Fields	\$50,000	\$50,000	GF (Free Cash)
10(p)	Firefighter Protection Turnout Gear	\$88,000	\$88,000	GF (Free Cash)
11	Sewer System Improvements			
11(a)	Sanitary Sewer System Improvements	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$900,000 Wastewater EF (Debt) + \$300,000 Wastewater EF (RE)
11(b)	Pump Station Upgrades	\$100,000	\$100,000	Wastewater EF (Debt)
12	School Capital Projects & Equipment			
12(a)	School Technology	\$737,000	\$737,000	\$502,000 GF (Debt) + \$235,000 GF (Free Cash)
12(b)	Food Service Equipment	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$34,000 GF (Debt) [also \$30,000 Food Service RF for a total of \$64,000]
12(c)	Classroom Furniture	\$150,000	\$150,000	GF (Debt)

Continued on inside of rear cover

Executive Summary

Over the past several months, the Capital Expenditures Committee (CEC) has reviewed proposals from the municipal departments and school administration as well as various citizens groups. We have fully vetted all the capital requests, except those listed as “pending” in the table on the insides of the covers and in the Warrant Article Recommendations. Elimination, refinement, and fine-tuning of these requests have taken place during this process; therefore, even though not all of the original requests appear in the Capital motions, *Town Meeting will generally observe consensus among the boards and committees relative to capital articles.*

The Community Preservation Act (CPA) in Lexington is now five years old. Article 17 proposes to reduce the CPA surcharge from 3% to 1%. Please refer to the discussion of this Article beginning on Page 51 for more detailed information regarding the issues, as we see them, regarding this measure.

Proposals to perform major renovations of the Bridge & Bowman elementary schools and reconstruction of the Estabrook elementary school are being advanced under Article 13(a) and (b). Because those appropriations are candidates for inclusion into the estimated full-project costs presented, likely this Fall, to a Special Town Meeting—and then to the Lexington voters in a Proposition 2½ Debt-Exclusion Referendum—Town Meeting Members are encouraged to give serious consideration now to understanding the necessity for, and process involved in, these projects.

The Town continues to confront many “big ticket” projects (i.e., over \$1 million), including (in no particular order and not meant to be all inclusive):

- Roads and Sidewalks—a continuing need
- Stone Building (previously the East Lexington Library) post-stabilization renovation
- Police Station renovation
- Fire Headquarters renovation
- Town Office Building renovation—currently underway
- Senior/Community Center
- Use of the “White House” Site (1557 Massachusetts Avenue; previously the Barnes property)
- Traffic Mitigation—a continuing need
- Community (Affordable) Housing
- Conservation/Open Space Land
- Recreation Facilities—a continuing need
- West Lexington Greenway Implementation
- School Buildings Renovation & Reconstruction
- Minuteman Career & Technical High School renovation

Continued leadership and cooperation by the Board of Selectmen, School Committee, Community Preservation Committee, and Permanent Building Committee are needed to rationalize, refine, prioritize and schedule these projects for the next several years—with realistic numbers put forth in the 5-year projections—as it is certain that we cannot afford to do all of them within the foreseeable future. (Important: See Pages 15–17)

Table of Contents

Summary of Warrant Article Recommendations	2
Executive Summary	3
The Mission of the Capital Expenditures Committee	7
How to Read This Report	7
Summary of FY2012 Capital-Budget Requests	8
Capital Budget.....	9
Big-Ticket Projects.....	9
The Community Preservation Act (CPA)	11
Enterprise-Fund Projects	13
Revolving-Fund Projects.....	14
Small-Ticket Projects	15
Five-Year Capital Plan	15
Programs	18
Conservation and Open Space	18
Senior/Community Center	18
Fire	19
Police.....	20
Library.....	21
Public Works.....	21
Public Services Building	26
Public Facilities	27
Recreation	28
Schools	29
Information Technology (IT) Infrastructure (Town-wide)	29
Warrant Article Analysis and Recommendations	30
Article 7 (3 rd Fund Only): Establish and Continue Departmental Revolving Funds—	
DPW Compost Operations	30
(a) <i>Culvert Replacement</i>	30
(b) <i>Compost Facility Green Waste (Anaerobic Facility) Study</i>	30
Article 8: Appropriate the FY2012 Community Preservation Committee	
Operating Budget and CPA Projects (Multiple Categories)	31
(a) <i>Archives & Records Management/Conservation (Historic Resources)</i>	31
(b) <i>East Lexington Fire Equipment Doors Replacement (Historic Resources)</i>	31
(c) <i>Leary Property Planning Funds (Community Housing)</i>	32
(d) <i>LexHAB—Set-Aside for Housing Acquisition (Community Housing)</i>	32
(e) <i>Battle Green Monument Restoration (Historic Resources)</i>	33
(f) <i>Battle Green Master Plan Implementation (Historic Resources)</i>	33
(g) <i>Center Playfields Drainage – Phase II (Recreational Use)</i>	34
(h) <i>Muzzey High Condo Association—Window Replacement (Historic Resources)</i>	34
(i) <i>Vynebrooke Village Drainage Improvements (Community Housing)</i>	35
(j) <i>Busa Farm Debt Service (Potentially Multiple)</i>	36
(k) <i>Cotton Farm Debt Service (Open Space)</i>	36
(l) <i>Administrative Budget</i>	37
Article 9: Appropriate for Recreation Capital Project—Town Pool Renovations.....	37

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

Article 10: Appropriate for Municipal Capital Projects and Equipment	38
(a) <i>Dam Repair—Phase I</i>	38
(b) <i>DPW Equipment</i>	38
(c) <i>Storm Drainage Improvements</i>	39
(d) <i>Sidewalk Improvements and Easements</i>	39
(e) <i>Replacement of Ambulance</i>	39
(f) <i>MIS Technology Improvement Program</i>	39
(g) <i>Townwide Electronic Document Management System</i>	40
(h) <i>Hydrant Replacement Project</i>	40
(i) <i>South Lexington Transportation Master Plan</i>	40
(j) <i>Street Improvements and Easements</i>	41
(k) <i>Westview Cemetery Irrigation – Phase III</i>	41
(l) <i>Comprehensive Watershed Stormwater Management</i>	42
(m) <i>Townwide Signalization Improvement</i>	42
(n) <i>Waltham Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements</i>	42
(o) <i>Park Improvements – Athletic Fields</i>	42
(p) <i>Firefighter Protection Turnout Gear</i>	43
Article 11: Appropriate for Sewer System Improvements	43
(a) <i>Sanitary Sewer System Improvements</i>	43
(b) <i>Pump Station Upgrades</i>	43
Article 12: Appropriate for School Capital Projects and Equipment	44
(a) <i>School Technology</i>	44
(b) <i>Food Service Equipment</i>	44
(c) <i>Classroom Furniture</i>	45
Article 13: Appropriate for Public Facilities Capital Projects	45
(a) <i>Bridge and Bowman Schools Renovation Design, Development and Engineering (Additional)</i>	45
(b) <i>Estabrook School Feasibility and Related Street-Access Improvements</i>	46
(c) <i>School Building Envelope and Systems</i>	46
(d) <i>School Improvement Projects</i>	46
(e) <i>Clarke Middle School Paving Improvements</i>	48
(f) <i>Lexington High School Roof Repair</i>	48
(g) <i>Hastings School Playground Expansion</i>	48
(h) <i>School Paving Program</i>	49
(i) <i>Diamond Middle School [Modular] Extraordinary Repair</i>	49
(j) <i>Municipal Building Envelope and Systems</i>	49
(k) <i>Repair of Fire Station Floor</i>	49
(l) <i>Library Material Handling System Design</i>	49
Article 14: Street Acceptance—Frances Road (Citizen Article)	50
Article 15: Appropriate for Community Center (Citizen Article)	50
Article 17: Reduce Community Preservation Act (CPA) Surcharge (Citizen Article)	51
Article 19: Rescind Prior Borrowing Authorizations	54
Article 20: Establish And Appropriate To Specified Stabilization Funds	54
Article 21: Appropriate to Stabilization Fund	55
Article 22: Appropriate from Debt Service Stabilization Fund	55
Article 25: Appropriate for Authorized Capital Improvements	56
Article 27: Amend General Bylaws—Private Ways	56
Article 29: Amend Permanent Building Committee Bylaw	57
Article 30: Amend Bylaw—Town Meeting Procedure	57
Article 33: Accept State LAND Grant—Cotton Farm Purchase	57
Article 34: Approve Battle Green Master Plan	58
Article 35: Support and Petition for Municipal Utility Act	58
Article 44: Accept Gift of Land—Off Hartwell Avenue	58
Summary of Warrant Article Recommendations (<i>continued</i>)	59

The Mission of the Capital Expenditures Committee

From the Code of the Town of Lexington (§29-13):

- A. *Each year the Capital Expenditures Committee shall request and receive from the Town boards and departments a list of all capital expenditures that may be required within the ensuing five-year period. The Committee shall consider the relative need, timing and cost of these projects, the adequacy thereof and the effect these expenditures might have on the financial position of the Town.*
- B. *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 or otherwise distributing 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.*

From the Code of the Town of Lexington (§29-26):

...the Capital Expenditures Committee shall state whether it endorses each recommendation of the Community Preservation Committee.

How to Read This Report

Our report is divided into four sections:

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

Where our narrative includes a "See Article __", it is referring you to that Article in the last section—"Warrant Article Analysis and Recommendations". In that section you will find:

We have quoted from the Town's or a Town Committee's documentation for each of the Articles on which we are reporting. If we believe that quote has both adequately described the proposed work and satisfactorily made the case for the Town's need, at least for the purpose of your deliberations—which is often the case—you will not find us paraphrasing or otherwise reiterating either of those matters in this report. However, additional narrative is included if we don't feel that is the case.

Our Committee's recommendations and how we voted are shown only in the boxed header for each Article and, if applicable, in any sub-elements unless there are further comments on our recommendation. If there are such comments, they will be *in italics* at the end of the text below the boxed header.

Our oral report on Town Meeting floor will verify our written report and present any new information not available as of this writing. When we report on a capital article on Town Meeting floor during the deliberations, a committee member will provide the committee's recommendation and, if applicable, comments related to that recommendation.

Summary of FY2012 Capital-Budget Requests

Art.		Requests							
		Tax Levy Debt	Cash*	Enterprise Funds	State Chap. 90 (Roads)	Approp. & Auth. Other	Total	Non- Approp.	CEC Recommend
	Public Works								
7(a)	Compost Facility Culverts					\$65,000	\$65,000		\$65,000
7(b)	Compost Facility Green-Waste Study					\$52,000	\$52,000		\$52,000
10(b)	DPW Equipment	\$365,000		\$120,100			\$485,100		\$485,100
11	Wastewater Improvements			\$1,300,000			\$1,300,000		\$1,300,000
10(h)	Hydrant Replacement		\$25,000	\$25,000			\$50,000		\$50,000
10(d)	Sidewalk Improvements	\$200,000					\$200,000		\$200,000
10(j)	Street Improvements		\$846,602		\$700,000		\$1,546,602		\$1,546,602
10(c)	Storm Drain Improvements	\$500,000					\$500,000		\$500,000
10(i)	South Lexington Transportation Master Plan					\$125,000	\$125,000		\$125,000
10(n)	Watham St Pedestrian Safety Improvements					\$66,000	\$66,000		\$66,000
10(l)	Comprehensive Watershed Stormwater Management		\$50,000				\$50,000		\$50,000
10(a)	Dam Repair—Phase I	\$270,000					\$270,000		\$270,000
10(m)	Town Wide Traffic Signalization		\$42,000				\$42,000		\$42,000
10(k)	Westview Cemetery Irrigation—Phase III		\$35,000				\$35,000		\$35,000
8(e)	Battle Green Monument Restoration		\$50,000				\$50,000		\$50,000
14	Street Acceptance—Frances Road					\$200,000	\$200,000		\$200,000
	Economic Development								
8(f)	Battle Green Master Plan Implementation		\$50,000				\$50,000		\$50,000
	Police/Fire								
10(p)	Firefighter Protection Turnout Gear		\$88,000				\$88,000		\$88,000
10(e)	Replace Ambulance	\$240,000					\$240,000		\$240,000
	Recreation								
9	Town Pool Renovation			\$165,000			\$165,000		\$165,000
10(o)	Park Improvements—Athletic Fields		\$50,000				\$50,000		\$50,000
8(g)	Center Playfields Drainage—Phase II		\$911,863				\$911,863		\$911,863
	Miscellaneous Municipal								
8(a)	Town Clerk Archives & Records Management/Conservation		\$150,000				\$150,000		\$150,000
10(f)	MIS Tech Improvement Program	\$165,000					\$165,000		\$165,000
10(g)	Electronic Document Management Sys	\$410,000					\$410,000		\$410,000
8(c)	Leary Property Planning Funds		\$30,000				\$30,000		\$0
	Schools								
12(a)	Technology	\$502,000	\$235,000				\$737,000		\$737,000
12(c)	Classroom Furniture	\$150,000					\$150,000		\$150,000
12(b)	Food Service Equipment	\$34,000					\$34,000	\$30,000	\$64,000
	Facilities								
13(a)	Bridge & Bowman Renovation DD&E	\$280,000					\$280,000		\$280,000
13(b)	Estabrook School Feasibility and Related Street Access Improvements	\$1,150,000					\$1,150,000		\$1,150,000
13(f)	High School Roof Repair	\$659,678					\$659,678	\$338,322	\$998,000
13(d)	School Improvement Projects	\$325,000	\$320,000				\$645,000		\$645,000
13(h)	School Paving Program		\$50,000				\$50,000		\$50,000
13(c)	School Bldgs Envelope & Systems		\$300,000				\$300,000		\$300,000
13(j)	Municipal Bldgs Envelope & Systems		\$165,572				\$165,572		\$165,572
13(i)	Diamond Modular Extraordinary Repairs		\$75,000				\$75,000		\$75,000
13(l)	Library Mat'l Handling System Design		\$100,000				\$100,000		\$100,000
13(e)	Clarke Paving Improvements	\$125,000					\$125,000		\$125,000
13(g)	Hastings School Playground Expansion	\$75,000					\$75,000		\$75,000
13(k)	Repair Fire Station (Headquarters) Floor	\$450,000					\$450,000		\$450,000
8(b)	East Lexington Fire Station Equipment Doors		\$60,000				\$60,000		\$60,000
	Community-Wide (CPA Funded) **								
8(d)	LexHAB Set-Aside Housing Acquisition		\$450,000				\$450,000		\$450,000
8(i)	Vynebrook Village Drainage		\$364,800				\$364,800		\$364,800
8(h)	Muzzey High Condominium Association—Window Replacement ***		\$0				\$0		\$0
	Totals	\$5,900,678	\$4,448,837	\$1,610,100	\$700,000	\$508,000	\$13,167,615	\$368,322	\$13,505,937

* All types (including set-aside for roads from FY2001 Override); see the Summary on the inside of the covers or the Warrant Article Analysis for the specific types.

**Not shown are \$150,000 for the CPC's Administrative Budget (Article 8(l)), \$974,600 for the 2nd-year debt service on the bond for the FY2010 purchase of the Busa-Farm land (Article 8(j)), \$1,300,604 to cover the 2nd payment on the FY2011 purchase of the Cotton-Farm land (Article 8(k)), and \$124,057 for debt service using State reimbursement for school upgrade project (Article 22).

***Originally requested at \$273, 915, but applicant withdrew its request on March 15, 2011.

Capital Budget

Lexington allocates appropriate resources to needed capital projects by considering them in four categories:

- Big-ticket projects (greater than \$1,000,000);
- Small-ticket projects (between \$25,000 and \$1,000,000);
- Enterprise & Revolving Funds projects (greater than \$25,000); and
- Community Preservation Fund projects (any dollar amount).

The Capital Expenditures Committee:

- Assesses capital needs brought forward by each department (municipal and schools) as well as the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) through the annual budgeting process;
- Works with those departments and the CPC 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, this Committee 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 our 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 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 as material, labor, and contract-management costs are often highly variable—even over a period of just a few 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, unless otherwise specified.

Big-Ticket Projects

Big-ticket capital projects typically 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 Town Manager and Selectmen's capital policy has generally maintained that such big-ticket projects (but not necessarily including those proposed for funding under the CPA) will be funded through borrowing, consistent with their expected life and with responsible annual budgeting for operating needs. Further, this borrowing is generally done through voter-approved "debt-exclusion" overrides, which place the costs of financing these projects outside the Proposition 2½ tax-levy limit. The latter goal has not always been satisfied. The Town's share of the costs to renovate Cary Memorial 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. At the 2008 Annual Town Meeting, the Woburn Street reconstruction (\$1.4 million, including \$700,000 of the State's Chapter 90 funding) was funded without a debt-exclusion, largely because it would be too much to ask voters to approve debt-exclusions in consecutive years. The authorization at the 2009 May Special Town Meeting to purchase the Busa property (total cost \$4.197 million) did not require a debt-exclusion vote as it uses CPA funds. Similarly, at the 2010 Annual Town Meeting, the Town Office Building Renovation—estimated at about \$1.8 million, of which \$1.5 million was funded under the CPA—was funded without a debt-exclusion vote. It is important to bear these cases in mind in thinking about major capital investments. Thus, not every big-ticket project, or element of an existing project, is subjected to a debt-exclusion vote. When they are not—with the exception of those using CPA funds—the costs are absorbed within the operating budget, which has significant implications for the financing of other Town needs.

Further, the existence of the Community Preservation Fund (CPF) in Lexington has also resulted in serious debate as to whether, and if so, when CPA-funded Big-Ticket items should be funded with debt. At the 2009 Annual Town Meeting, you approved the purchase of the Busa property using debt. Subsequently, the CPC, Board of Selectmen, CEC, Appropriation Committee, and Town staff held discussions regarding CPF reserve and debt-versus-cash financing policies and concluded that reserves of \$2 million in the CPF are appropriate. Further discussions recommended short-term bonding for the Busa property, consistent with those policies. This Committee endorsed the policies and the specific bonding for the Busa property. At the 2010 Annual Town Meeting, you approved the purchase of the Cotton Farm property—once again with short-term financing. We expect to be parties to comparable discussions as other Big Ticket items are proposed for funding by the CPF.

The Projects Agenda

Among the big-ticket items Lexington is currently undertaking or may undertake in the future, we note and provide an update here on these from our last-year's report:

- Renovation or reconstruction of the “White House” (the old School Administration Building at 1557 Massachusetts Avenue). Its future use is uncertain, but given its current state of deterioration, under normal circumstances it will need considerable attention in the near future. (For the time being, we are presuming that a total demolition would not be allowed by the Town's Historic District Commission and that sale or lease of the property to a commercial entity is not planned.) The property is under control of the Board of Selectmen and, as of this report, it has not designated any use for the site. This year Citizen's Article 15 requests funds (an, at-present, unknown amount from unknown sources) for building a community center on this site.
- Renovation or replacement of three elementary schools and renovation at the high school. See Article 13(a) and (b) regarding three of the elementary schools, and 13(f) regarding the High School.
- Renovation of the Stone Building at 735 Massachusetts Avenue. No funds are being requested for this project at this Town Meeting.
- Reconstruction of several major arterial roads. There are several arterial roads that need reconstructing, probably through a debt exclusion. There is also the matter of the large amount of work that is needed on our sidewalks—both in the Central Business District (CBD) and elsewhere in Town. While we are not aware, as of this report, of any debt exclusion for roads or sidewalks, see Articles 10(d) and (j) for the FY2012 funding.
- Police Station renovations to accommodate improved working efficiencies. No funds are being requested at this Town Meeting.
- Fire station headquarters redesign and renovations. Funds for renovating the equipment floor of the main station and providing additional space in modular facilities are being requested this year under Article 13(k).

- West Lexington Greenway. This is the proposed trail system west of I-95/Route 128 to connect the Minuteman Bikeway and the Minuteman National Historic Park. No funds are being requested at this Town Meeting.
- Traffic Mitigation. Minor funds are being requested at this Town Meeting.

Other Project Status and Needs

A year ago this report called attention to the Schools PK–12 Master Plan which recommended ultimately replacing the Estabrook elementary school and replacing or renovating with an addition the Hastings elementary school. In the past year, the presence of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) at Estabrook has re-prioritized the replacing this building. Discussions with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) required Lexington to replace that school within four years, or remove all unauthorized PCB in the building. To that end, Lexington submitted an Emergency Statement of Interest (SOI) to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) to replace that school and last month, on the 9th, the MSBA approved inviting Lexington to participate in a Feasibility Study. MSBA will likely offer a funding arrangement with Lexington eligible to receive between 31% and 40% reimbursement for approved program elements. Funding for the Feasibility Study is requested under Article 13(b). That study includes design through schematics and full Design & Engineering (D&E) funding. Construction documents, bidding, and construction are included in the funding agreement. D&E funding for the Bridge and Bowman elementary schools renovation was appropriated at the 2010 Annual Town Meeting (Article 16(c)). This year, additional D&E monies will be requested under Article 13(a) to expand the scope of that project to accommodate renovating existing space resulting in four additional classrooms for each school and enhanced building systems within those buildings.

The Community Preservation Act (CPA)

On March 6, 2006, Lexington voters approved adopting the CPA for our Town at the level of a 3% surcharge on property taxes. (See Article 17 for a proposal to reduce the surcharge percentage to 1%, effective for FY2013.) The proceeds under the CPA may be used for various capital projects within the categories of Community Housing, Historic Resources, Open Space, and Recreational Use. (There are limitations in the Act regarding which projects within those categories can be funded under the Act.) According to the CPC [Communication, March 15, 2011], as of July 1, 2010, it had recommended, and Town Meeting approved, \$23,300,147. Of that, \$4,737,641 (20.3%) was for Community Housing, \$5,922,678 (25.4%) for Historic Resources, \$6,483,017 (27.8%) for Open Space, \$1,837,811 (7.9%) for Recreational Use, and \$4,319,000 (18.5%) for pending purpose(s) (i.e., the full approval for the Busa-Farm purchase and related expenses). Also, a yearly amount (now \$150,000—and \$430,000 to that date) is for the Administrative Budget—with unneeded funds returned, yearly.

At this time, if all of the CPC-recommended project & debt appropriations (See Article 8) (but excluding the \$150,000 Administrative Budget)—which total \$4,124,982—are approved by this Town Meeting, this would add (with percentages of that projects & debt total) \$844,800 (20.5%) for Community Housing, \$310,000 (7.5%) for Historic Resources, \$1,300,604 (31.5%) for Open Space, \$911,863 (22.1%) for Recreational Use, and \$757,715 (18.4%) for pending purpose(s) (i.e., the appropriation for the Busa-Farm purchase’s 2nd of 3 debt-service payments).

Our CPA-surcharge funding is eligible for State matching—which is always based on each town’s prior-fiscal-year’s property-tax surcharges—although the matching level is not guaranteed. For those communities that have adopted the maximum 3% surcharge—as Lexington has done—when there aren’t sufficient funds for a 100% match, the State does a 2nd-round, and potentially 3rd-round, calculation to determine the final match.

As the matches are funded from the State’s CPA Trust Funded—which gets its revenue from surcharges on the fees on property transactions at the Registry of Deeds, the full extent of the impact on those fees because of the state of the recovery from the economic recession is unknown and, thus, there is uncertainty about the level of future State-matching funds. A bill that made good progress in the last session of the State Legislature, that along with addressing other changes to the CPA would set a

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

minimum annual trust fund match of 75%, has been reintroduced in the current session; however, there is no assurance of if and when it would be passed and signed by the Governor.

This has been the history, at the State level, of its distributions under the CPA in the years relevant to Lexington:

For Communities Having Adopted CPA (out of total of 351)					
Year in which match distributed	Number	Percentage of Massachusetts	Total of all CPA Surcharges (\$M)	Total Match	
				Amount (\$M)	Percentage [†]
FY2008 (Actual)	113	32.2%	\$68.1	\$68.1	100.0%
FY2009 (Actual)	127	36.2%	\$74.1	\$54.6	73.7%
FY2010 (Actual)	135	38.5%	\$78.2	\$31.5	40.4%
FY2011 (Actual)	142	40.5%	\$82.0	\$25.9	31.6%
†Adjusted, if necessary, for \$-amount rounding			Totals	\$302.4	\$180.1
					59.6%

Note: In FY2011, one small community voted to adopt the CPA (with a 1% surcharge) that will have a very-small effect on the FY2012 match. Another 4 communities have recently voted to adopt the CPA, so their first match would not be until at least FY2013.

And here is the matching received by Lexington from the State, along with a projection for FY2012:

Year in which match received	Prior-Year's CPA Surcharge Collected [†]	State Matching Percentage				Total Match Amount
		1st Round	2nd Round	3rd Round	Total	
FY2008 (Actual)	\$2,556,362	100.0%	N/A	N/A	100.0%	\$2,556,362
FY2009 (Actual)	\$2,777,882	67.6%	1.8%	N/A	69.4%	\$1,927,708
FY2010 (Actual)	\$2,931,678	34.8%	0.9%	0.5%	36.2%	\$1,060,390
FY2011 (Actual)	\$3,042,587	27.2%	0.6%	0.4%	28.2%	\$858,729
Total Actual	\$11,308,509	Received to date			56.6%	\$6,403,189
FY2012 (Projected)	\$3,181,549	TBD	TBD	TBD	27.0%	\$859,000
Totals including projected	\$14,490,058				50.1%	\$7,262,189

[†] As used by the State

At this time, the latest estimate by the Massachusetts Department of Revenue (DOR) with regard to the potential match percentage for FY2012 is that the 1st Round should be 25%. (As shown above, our prior experience in the 2nd & 3rd rounds has been in the range of 1.8% to 1.0% more.) For the FY2012 projections in the above table, we're using the same estimate of this year's match percentage that the Town is using which, in turn, is the same estimated match amount—as shown in the Brown Book (Appendix C, Page C-3).

Although there are other factors that will reduce in the size of the State's CPA Trust Fund from which the matches are made (e.g., its administrative expenses and interest earned on that Fund), the following is a year-to-year comparison of CPA Trust Fund collections at the Registry of Deeds, its revenue source, for the first five months of this fiscal year—the latest data we have been given, so far.

CPA Trust Fund Collections at the Registry of Deeds (\$M)				
Month	FY2010	FY2011	Change	Percentage
Sep	\$2.287	\$2.364	\$0.077	3.4%
Oct	\$2.132	\$2.479	\$0.347	16.3%
Nov	\$2.272	\$2.442	\$0.170	7.5%
Dec	\$2.146	\$2.530	\$0.384	17.9%
Totals:	\$8.837	\$9.815	\$0.978	11.1%

Source: Community Preservation Coalition communication, February 10, 2011

We believe the Town projected match for this year is not unreasonable. If the final match percentage were to be 25% (which includes nothing from the 2nd and 3rd Round), then the estimated match amount would be \$795,387—which is \$63,613 less than the Town's currently budgeted estimate. As the projected balance in the CPF if all proposed projects and the administrative budget for FY2012 were approved is presently calculated to be at least \$2,041,669 [CPC Communication, March 15, 2011], that reduction from the estimated match amount is not a material consequence.)

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

So while the match level has fallen substantially since our first match, we emphasize that even at the DOR's currently estimated 1st Round percentage, our Town will receive a significant contribution toward the cost of our CPA-funded projects to supplement the direct funding from the surcharge that is part of our tax levy.

With that estimated balance after all currently contemplated FY2012 actions, our projection for the CPA funding available for FY2013 would be as follows:

Source	Amount
Projected End-of-FY2012 Balance	\$2,041,669
Application of LAND Grant toward Cotton-Farm Purchase Costs (Conditional on Mass DOR Concurrence)	\$500,000
Estimated FY2013 Surcharge at 3% Rate with 2.5% increase over FY2012 Budgeted Surcharge and 91% collection	\$3,084,604
Estimate State Match Received in FY2013 at 25% match with 91% collection of FY2012 Budgeted Surcharge	\$752,343
Estimated FY2013 Interest Income on the CPF Balance	\$33,000
Estimated Total Available for FY2013	\$6,411,616
Existing Obligations (last of debt service for purchases of the Busa & Cotton Farms)	-\$1,930,300
Estimated Discretionary Funding Available in FY2013 with Surcharge at Current Percentage	\$4,481,316

Projects are put forth to Town Meeting for action by a Community Preservation Committee (CPC) whose membership is prescribed in the Code of Lexington as follows:

§ 29-23A. There is hereby established a Community Preservation Committee pursuant to Section 5 of Chapter 44B of the General Laws (the "Act") consisting of nine members. The Board of Selectmen shall appoint three members of the Community Preservation Committee and the following bodies shall each select one of its members for membership on the Community Preservation Committee: the Conservation Commission, the Planning Board, the Recreation Committee, the Historical Commission, the Housing Authority and the Housing Partnership.

Town Meeting only has the options of approval, reduction, or disapproval; it cannot change the purpose, but Town Counsel has provided an opinion that Town Meeting can change the funding mechanism (cash or debt). As with any capital project, the CEC will give our recommendation on each of the projects put before the Town Meeting. (See Article 8)

The CPA provides an alternative funding mechanism for capital projects. *The CPA creates a separate pool of money that can be used for a limited set of projects and cannot be prioritized against the Town's traditional capital needs. It is this dichotomy of funds and debate that is challenging.*

See the CPA Summary in the Brown Book (Appendix C, Page C-3) for a summary of the CPF status as of its publication on February 28th of this year.

Enterprise-Fund Projects

The Town operates three enterprise funds for revenue-producing activities funded outside the tax levy by user fees (water distribution, wastewater distribution [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 (which is expected to continue until February 1, 2018, when that debt will be retired). Unlike property-tax revenues, enterprise-fund fees are *not* subject to a limit under Proposition 2½.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

Coming before this Town Meeting is one Recreation Enterprise-funded project (see Article (9)) and two projects funded entirely with Wastewater Enterprise funds. (See Article 11) In addition, Water and Wastewater Enterprise Funds are sometimes used to buy heavy trucks and equipment. In FY2012, a 6-wheel dump truck will be purchased for the Water Division using Water Enterprise Funds. (See Article 10(b))

From a capital standpoint, enterprise-funded projects are evaluated in terms of service and cost. For example, 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. (There is no project for Water Distribution System Improvements in the FY2012 Budget as there is sufficient prior-year funded work to accomplish in the next construction cycle.)

The following tables reflect the 5-year Capital Expenditure budgets for these funds.

Water Enterprise-Fund Budget

	FY2012 Requested	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
		Projected			
Water Distribution Improvements		\$900,000	\$575,000	\$575,000	\$575,000
Hydrant Replacement Program	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Equipment Replacement	\$120,100		\$108,500		\$85,000
Automatic Water-Meter Reading System		\$353,625	\$273,000	\$274,000	
Totals	\$145,100	\$1,278,625	\$981,500	\$874,000	\$685,000

Wastewater Enterprise-Fund Budget

	FY2012 Requested	2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
		Projected			
Wastewater System Improvements	\$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
Equipment Replacement			\$108,500		\$85,000
Automatic Water-Meter Reading System		\$353,625	\$273,000	\$274,000	
Totals	\$1,300,000	\$1,653,625	\$1,681,500	\$1,574,000	\$1,385,000

Recreation Enterprise-Fund Budget

	FY2012 Requested	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
		Projected			
Center Complex Additional Lights		\$172,927			
Pine Meadows Improvements—Equipment		\$42,000		\$52,000	\$45,000
Pond and Drainage Improvements to Preserve Pine Meadows Golf Course [†]			\$252,000		
Town Pool Renovations	\$165,000				\$1,120,000
Park Improvement—Hard-Court Resurfacing		\$110,000		\$75,000	\$40,000
Totals	\$165,000	\$324,927	\$252,000	\$127,000	\$1,205,000

Note: Does not include recreation-related projects for which other funding (e.g., CPF or GF) would be requested nor the on-going \$100,000/year contribution to the Lincoln Fields debt service that will continue until FY2018.

[†]Candidate for CPF, but not yet submitted to the CPC.

Revolving-Fund Projects

Revolving funds established under the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44, Section 53E½, must be authorized annually by vote of the Town Meeting. The fund is credited with only the departmental receipts received in connection with the programs supported by such revolving fund, and expenditures may be made from the revolving fund, without further appropriation, for those programs.

Revolving funds are usually expended to cover non-capital costs and, therefore, this Committee normally doesn't report on their annual authorizations. However, as the Town Manager is planning to expend up to

\$117,000 in FY2012 under the DPW Compost Facility Revolving Fund for two Capital projects, we are including it in this report.

One request is for the replacement of three deteriorated culverts under the access road to the Hartwell Avenue Compost Facility. (See Article 7(a)). The second request is for an assessment of the viability of the Hartwell Avenue Compost Facility as a site for a privately operated, anaerobic, “green waste” processing facility. (See Article 7(b))

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—except for those funded by the CPF) and \$1 million, and represent projects that should be funded on a regular, timely basis to maintain Town infrastructure. With the creation of the Department of Public Facilities as well as the Building Envelope “set-aside” passed in the June 2006 operating override, a new emphasis has been placed on continual infrastructure maintenance—a move that this Committee naturally applauds. As that Building Envelope “set-aside” was scaled for just the Municipal buildings (see Article 13(j) for this year’s request, which now includes systems along with the envelope), we were also pleased to see a parallel “set-aside” for the Schools buildings in FY2010 (see Article 13(c) for this year’s request, which also now includes systems). 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. In the FY2012 capital budget, requests have also been made for new capital renewal “programs” in the areas of School Building Flooring and Systemwide School Window Treatment (see sub-items within Article 13(d) for this year’s request) and in School Paving (see Article 13(h) for this year’s request).

Five-Year Capital Plan

The table on the next two pages summarizes the Town’s five-year capital plan that this Committee is submitting for Town Meeting consideration. It reflects the FY2012 amounts whose appropriation we expect to be requested at the 2011 ATM—as addressed in this report—and the contemplated FY2013-FY2016 requests. We started with what is shown in the Brown Book, Page XI-18. Those requests have been updated based on any later information we received and we have made numerous, additional, entries in the out years where this Committee feels funding might well be requested based on earlier studies, design & engineering work, or the existence of a multi-phase project; but where, to our knowledge, there is, often no formal position taken by the Town. In that vein, **there are important caveats to that table:**

- **Please see the footnotes for some information on the status of one or more of the entries.**
- **As noted earlier in the Executive Summary, there are a very-large number of Big-Ticket Projects facing this Town in the near future—whether for funding by the GF (either within levy or more likely via excluded debt, if approved by the voters) or the CPF—and not all of them are shown in the out-years of this five-year plan (e.g., addressing the roadway infrastructure needs, as just one example). Even without the values of the TBD entries—which will inevitably total many millions of dollars once determined—the total of the now-cited out-year items in our table is \$95.2 million. That total for those 4 years is, on average per year, 81% more than the FY2012 request. Even with some successful debt-exclusion referendums, that will likely require major reprogramming of those out-year projects. While this Committee appreciates the Town’s concern about citing a very preliminary estimate for a project whose scope and timing are not at all well defined at this point in time—such that any such number or timing may become contentious when later, better-defined, dollar values, execution dates, and planned funding sources are developed—this Committee finds the current approach untenable when there’s a prescribed need to present, evaluate, and make recommendations on the Town’s five year capital needs. We continue to urge the Town to present a prioritized and time-phased list of such Big-Ticket Projects and indicate the plan for funding of its current best-guess of the likely costs.**

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN (FY2012–FY2016) ¹						
Capital Project Requests (by executing department)	FY2012 Request	FY2013 Plan	FY2014 Plan	FY2015 Plan	FY2016 Plan	Total
Fire						
Replacement of Ladder Truck			\$1,000,000			\$1,000,000
Public Safety Radio Connectivity ²		TBD	TBD			TBD
Replace Ambulance	\$240,000				\$0	\$240,000
Firefighter Protection Turnout Gear	\$88,000					\$88,000
Software (Police & Fire/EMS)	See joint entry below under Police					
Subtotal—Fire	\$328,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,328,000
Management Information Systems (MIS)						
Head End Equipment Replacement—Phase IV		\$60,000	\$125,000	\$250,000		\$435,000
MIS Technology Improvement Program	\$165,000	\$140,000			\$64,000	\$369,000
Replace Town Wide Phone Systems ³		TBD	TBD			TBD
Town-Wide Electronic Document Management System	\$410,000	\$80,000	\$60,000			\$550,000
Subtotal—MIS	\$575,000	\$280,000	\$185,000	\$250,000	\$64,000	\$1,354,000
Police						
Software (Police & Fire/EMS) (Joint Entry)					\$410,000	\$410,000
Subtotal—Police	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$410,000	\$410,000
Public Facilities						
Municipal Building Envelope	\$165,572	\$169,711	\$173,954	\$178,302	\$182,760	\$870,299
Community Center ⁴			TBD			TBD
Improvements to Senior Center (Muzzey)		\$315,000	\$15,000	\$400,000		\$730,000
Restoration of the Stone Building ⁴			TBD			TBD
Cary Memorial Building Upgrade		\$1,000,000	\$875,000	\$550,000		\$2,425,000
White House Stabilization		\$300,000				\$300,000
School Building Roofing Program	\$659,678	\$157,930			\$396,162	\$1,213,770
School Building Envelope Program	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$1,100,000
Clarke Auditorium Lighting & Technology Upgrade		\$90,000	\$170,000	\$60,000		\$320,000
Bridge & Bowman Renovation	\$280,000	\$18,340,786				\$18,620,786
Estabrook School Replacement	\$1,050,000	\$28,950,000				\$30,000,000
Estabrook School Secondary Access (Robinson Rd)	\$100,000	\$1,000,000				\$1,100,000
LHS Way Finding Signs		\$25,000				\$25,000
School Locker Program	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$50,000	\$25,000	\$525,000
LHS Overcrowding	\$175,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,175,000
School Building Flooring Program	\$50,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$550,000
School Window Treatments Extraordinary Repair	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$300,000
School Improvements (Other)	\$220,000					\$220,000
School Paving Program	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$375,000
School Interior Painting Program			\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$450,000
LHS Pervious Sidewalk and Landscape		\$40,000				\$40,000
Repair of Fire Station Floor and Temporary Administrative Offices	\$450,000	\$250,000				\$700,000
Diamond Modular Extraordinary Repairs	\$75,000					\$75,000
E. Lexington Fire Station Equip Doors	\$60,000					\$60,000
Clarke Paving Improvement	\$125,000					\$125,000
Hastings Playground Expansion	\$75,000					\$75,000
Police Station; Renovation and Add-on Design and Engineering ⁴			TBD			TBD
Library Material Handling System	\$100,000					\$100,000
Subtotal—Public Facilities	\$4,135,250	\$51,513,427	\$2,283,954	\$2,088,302	\$1,453,922	\$61,474,855
Public Works						
Mass Ave - Three Intersections Improvement		\$275,000				\$275,000
Dam Repair	\$270,000	\$270,000	\$10,000			\$550,000
Street Improvements	\$1,546,602	\$1,280,000	\$1,294,000	\$1,309,000	\$1,324,000	\$6,753,602
Water Distribution System Improvements		\$900,000	\$575,000	\$575,000	\$575,000	\$2,625,000
Wastewater System Improvements	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$6,000,000
Pump Station Upgrades	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$500,000
Town Wide Culvert Replacement	\$65,000	\$315,000	\$315,000	\$250,000		\$945,000
Storm Drainage Improvements	\$500,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,500,000
Equipment Replacement	\$485,100	\$515,700	\$538,700	\$490,700	\$405,700	\$2,435,900
Hastings Park Irrigation		\$80,000				\$80,000
Hydrant Replacement Program	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$250,000
Comprehensive Watershed Storm Water Management Study and Implementation	\$50,000	\$360,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,160,000
Town-wide Signalization Improvements	\$42,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$542,000
Automatic Water-Meter Reading System ⁵		\$707,250	\$546,000	\$548,000		\$1,801,250

Continued on next page with all footnotes

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL PLAN (FY2012–FY2016)¹ (Continued)						
Capital Project Requests (by executing department)	FY2012 Request	FY2013 Plan	FY2014 Plan	FY2015 Plan	FY2016 Plan	Total
Lexington Center Improvements (Streetscape & Central Business District Sidewalks)		\$120,000	\$1,110,000			\$1,230,000
Lexington Center Connectivity		\$125,000				\$125,000
Sidewalk Improvement ⁶	\$200,000	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$1,700,000
Concord Avenue Sidewalks		\$150,000	\$1,000,000			\$1,150,000
Westview Cemetery Irrigation Phase III	\$35,000					\$35,000
South Lexington Transportation Plan	\$125,000					\$125,000
Waltham Street Pedestrian Safety Imp	\$66,000					\$66,000
Street Acceptance-Frances Road	\$200,000					\$200,000
Battle Green Monument Restoration (part of Battle Green Master Plan Implementation)	\$50,000					\$50,000
Battle Green Master Plan Implementation ⁷	\$50,000	\$368,095	\$599,755			\$1,017,850
Compost Facility Green-Waste Study	\$52,000					\$52,000
Subtotal—Public Works	\$5,086,702	\$7,491,045	\$8,363,455	\$5,547,700	\$4,679,700	\$31,168,602
Recreation						
Town Pool Renovation	\$165,000				\$1,120,000	\$1,285,000
Center Playfields Drainage - Implementation Phase	\$911,863	\$605,718				\$1,517,581
Park Improvements - Athletic Fields	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$210,000	\$710,000
Athletic Facility Lighting		\$269,469		\$459,370		\$728,839
Pine Meadows Equipment		\$42,000		\$52,000	\$45,000	\$139,000
Pine Meadows Improvements			\$259,000			\$259,000
Park Improvements- Hard Court Resurfacing		\$110,000		\$75,000	\$40,000	\$225,000
Park and Playground Improvements		\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$240,000
ADA Accessibility Study				\$50,000		\$50,000
Subtotal—Recreation	\$1,126,863	\$1,137,187	\$519,000	\$896,370	\$1,475,000	\$5,154,420
Schools						
Technology Capital Request	\$737,000	\$725,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$3,262,000
Food Service Equipment	\$34,000	\$163,950	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$497,950
System Wide Technology Sustainability Plan		\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$2,000,000
Classroom Furniture	\$150,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$550,000
Subtotal—Schools	\$921,000	\$1,488,950	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	\$6,309,950
Miscellaneous Municipal						
Archives & Records Management/Records Conservation & Preservation	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$360,000
Leary Property Planning Funds	\$30,000					\$30,000
Subtotal—Miscellaneous Municipal	\$180,000	\$150,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$390,000
Community-Wide (CPF Funded)⁸						
LexHAB Set-Aside Housing Acquisition ⁴	\$450,000		TBD			TBD
Vynnebrook Village Drainage	\$364,800					\$364,800
Land Purchases ⁴			TBD			TBD
Lexington Housing Authority Projects ⁴			TBD			TBD
West Lexington Greenway ⁴		TBD		TBD		TBD
Muzzey High Cono Assoc Window Replacement ⁹	\$0					\$0
Subtotal—Community-Wide (CPF Funded)	\$814,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$364,800
Totals (NOT considering TBDs)	\$13,167,615	\$62,060,609	\$13,671,409	\$10,102,372	\$9,402,622	\$107,954,627

¹ All fund sources; individual amounts may be below the capital threshold if part of a multi-year effort or projected from CPF.

² Awaiting re-look at scope and management plan; had been \$427,517 in FY2012 & \$85,000 in FY2013 for a total of \$512,517.

³ Awaiting re-look at scope; had been \$600,000 in FY2012 & \$600,000 in FY2013 for a total of \$1,200,000.

⁴ Out-years are undefined at present, but there is a potential for one or more events in those years.

⁵ The start of this 3-phase program was deferred from FY2012 pending further review of the justification and pay-back period.

⁶ The program was extended into FY2016 as, even then, the Sidewalk Master Plan will still have a multi-million-dollar backlog.

⁷ The FY2013 & FY2014 amounts are just placeholders from the Plan submitted to the Board of Selectmen, but don't represent any decisions by that Board regarding implementation.

⁸ There are no out-year commitments by the CPC for anything except for the outstanding CPF-funded debt service. (See the ** footnote in the table on Page 8 for the FY2012 debt-service amounts and reference to that year's Administrative-Budget request; the FY2013 debt-service amounts—which are the last for any pending CPF-funded debt—are \$930,300 for the Busa-Farm & \$1,000,000 for the Cotton-Farm land purchases.)

⁹ Originally submitted to the CPC for \$253,915 and approved by the CPC with an additional \$20,000 for the Town's potential legal expenses when converted to a loan; however, on March 15, 2011, the request was withdrawn by the applicant as they are pursuing an alternate program through the Board of Selectmen with regard to adjusting the capped sale price of the units to include the total cost of the replacement windows.

Programs

Conservation and Open Space

The Town's use of the about 8-acre Busa Farm off Lowell Street, acquired in 2009 using the CPF, is under study by the Board of Selectmen-appointed Busa Land Use Committee (BLUC). The BLUC will provide to that Board its recommendation as to how that land might be allotted for the potential uses allowed by the CPA. Advocates have urged uses including community farming, community housing, and recreation fields. As of this report, the BLUC's plans to deliver its final report to the Board of Selectmen by next Monday, the 14th. Since the Town acquired the property, it has remained in farming under an agreement with the original owner. The 2nd of the three debt-service payments for that purchase is before this Town Meeting. (See Article 8(j))

An about 4.2-acre portion of the Cotton Farm off Marrett Road, acquired by the Town last year using the CPF, has three related actions before this Town Meeting. One is the 2nd of the three payments for that purchase. (See Article 8(k)) Another is to formally accept an already-announced grant from the State to help defray the cost of the purchase. (See Article 33) And the third is to accept a gift of about 14.5 acres off Harwell Avenue—which gift accompanied, but was not a part of, the purchase of the portion of the Cotton Farm. The property being gifted, which has wetlands along its frontage on that Avenue, is adjacent to the Town's Landfill and also abuts existing conservation land. (See Article 44)

Although not related to a Capital action, under Article 43 the Meeting is also being asked to accept the gift, for Conservation purposes, of a 33,480 square-foot parcel on Myrna Road (now or formerly of Robert B. Chase. The land, largely unbuildable, is part of an estate settlement. It contains part of the drainage from Willard's Woods into the Vinebrook Watershed and abuts wetlands in Burlington.

In the CPC's administrative budget, \$50,000 is included to enable the Conservation Commission to do preliminary research such as land surveys and appraisals as part of the process of bringing future land-acquisition opportunities to the table. (See Article 8(l))

Senior/Community Center

Funding to study some basic upgrades to the Senior Center in the Muzzey High Condominium Building were provided by last-year's ATM under Article 8(o)—\$45,100 from the CPF. The study was awarded to Bargmann, Hendrie & Archetype on November 19, 2010. DPF expects some significant progress reports about this June. The final report is expected to be delivered by this Fall and to include a phased approach to the recommended work. The heating/ventilating/air-conditioning (HVAC), lighting, handicapped-access availability, space use, and possible relocation of a present staircase are being studied and would enhance the present building's utility as the Director of Human Services reports that usage continues to increase. (The Assistant Director of Senior Services, in the Town's Human Services Department is also housed there.) The DPF is responsible for that study, but no funds are being requested at this time for what would be the next stage: design development of the work proposed to be done. It is anticipated that such a request would be presented to the CPC before the end of this December.

Although there is interest in having a larger space that would incorporate a multi-generationally-focused community center, such a vision of the future should not impede critical renovations at the present location. (Such a vision was to come before this Town Meeting under Article 15, but the request was incomplete and premature—especially as the proposed location was to be The "White House" (1557 Massachusetts Avenue; previously the Barnes property), but neither that location, nor any other, has been proposed by the Board of Selectmen for such a center.)

The "White House" (1557 Massachusetts Avenue; previously the Barnes property) remains in its current poor condition and as yet DPF has not spent the \$18,000 for a limited structural report appropriated from the CPF at last-year's ATM under Article 8(p).

Fire

The Fire Department uses industry standards and its own experience to establish the replacement schedule for its capital equipment. Unlike many pieces of Town equipment, fire engines and medic (rescue-ambulances) trucks are partially custom-made and equipped, require very detailed specifications, and typically require many months between placing the order and the delivery.

The mission of the Fire Department in the 21st century has shifted beyond traditional firefighting to emergency services, homeland security, and community education—with our firefighters now being trained for Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and Advanced Life Support (ALS). The equipment to perform these missions has changed with new technologies for firefighting and communications, yet the basic pumper truck, ladder truck, and rescue-ambulance are still essential to the mission.

Lexington must continue to replace its aging equipment and retain back-up capacity. The Town's 5-year Capital Budget indicates purchasing a new ambulance in FY2012 (see Article 10(e)) and a new Ladder Truck in FY2014. The table below includes the forecasted need for the other major capital vehicles in the current inventory. The Department will also replace 40 sets of turnout gear in FY2012. (See Article 10(p))

At the 2009 ATM, \$100,000 was appropriated (\$70,300 GF under Article 19(e); \$29,700 CPF under Article 11(i)) to continue the feasibility study funded at the 2008 ATM (Article 19(k)) of how better to preserve and renovate the Fire Department Headquarters (45 Bedford Street). After a review of the architect's study (by Donham & Sweeney, Architects), the Board of Selectman determined that instead of constructing a new Fire Headquarters, or remodeling and expanding the existing structure, to proceed with an interim solution that reinforces the main equipment floor by shoring it and deferred a decision on providing additional office space by using modular buildings. (The pressure-treated timber used for the shoring should last for at least 15 years and, with routine maintenance, the system can last indefinitely.) (See Article 13(k))

The increasing size of fire-fighting trucks has created a need to enlarge the door openings at the East Lexington Fire Station so as to increase the clearance between the door openings and the fire trucks (with their appendages), thus avoiding damage to the structure or equipment. (See Article 8(b))

Major Capital Equipment

Following is the current inventory of the Fire Department's major, capital-equipment, vehicles^{1,2}—ordered by the year of the planned replacement funding:

Replacement Funding	ID	Description	Model Year Purchased	Put-in-Service Date	Originally Projected Useful Life (years)	Original Cost
FY2012 (requested)	M-3	Ambulance/Rescue (International, CL-3-PL Custon)	2002	Oct 2002	10	\$159,050
FY2014 (projected)	L-1	Ladder Truck (E-One, Cyclone)	2000	Jun 2001	15	\$588,000
FY2015 (projected)	M-2	Ambulance/Rescue (Chevrolet, CL-3-Lifeline)	2006	Apr 2006	10	\$165,000
FY2017 (projected)	E-4	Pumper Truck (Ferrara/International)	2003	Jul 2003	13-14	\$210,000
FY2018 (projected)	M-1	Ambulance/Rescue (Chevrolet, CL-3-Lifeline)	2009	Jul 2009	10	\$204,000
FY2019 (projected)	E-3	Pumper Truck (E-One, Typhoon)	2005	Jan 2005	13-14	\$345,000
FY2020 (projected)	F-1	Forestry Truck (Chevrolet, 550/C&S)	2008	Oct 2008	10-12	\$80,000
FY2021 (projected)	E-1	Pumper Truck (Ferrara, Intruder II)	2007	Apr 2008	13-14	\$389,000
FY2023 (projected) ³	E-2	Pumper Truck (Ferrara, Inferno)	2010	Aug 2010	13-14	\$544,034

Notes

¹ Includes ID series "E" (pumpers), "F" (Forestry), "L" (ladder), & "M" (Medic) with one exception: F-2 is a skid unit that is an operating-budget item and, therefore, is not included in the capital-replacement schedule. (F-2 is used in conjunction with the F-1 truck.) Not included are ID series "C" (cars), "H" (trailer), "S" (service vehicles, including trailer), and a light unit as they are funded from the operating budget with one exception: C-6 is a capital-equipment item, but see footnote 2 for why it is not in the capital-replacement schedule.

² Another piece of capital-equipment vehicle in the inventory has ID C-6. It is a Bucket Truck (International, Model Year 1988) and it was put in service about Nov 1988. (Original cost was not readily known.) It is used to service the remaining wired fire-alarm circuits. It is not included in the replacement schedule as the Department is in the process of decommissioning (and removing) those wired circuits. When that is completed—which is now hoped to be completed this calendar year—C-6 will be removed from service, sold following the surplus-equipment procedures, and not replaced. (The delay in the decommissioning and removal reflects it is conducted by department personnel on overtime and also is weather dependent.)

³ Net cost was \$499,034 (\$544,034 less \$45,000 for the trade-in for old E-3), but gross cost being listed as future status of a trade-in is unknown—plus it's expected any purchase ~13 years out will, as with all the other out-year purchases, at a much higher cost.

Fire Department 5-Year Capital Appropriation History (All Funding Sources)

	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Fire Trucks	\$380,000	\$80,000		\$500,000	
Rescue-Ambulances			\$200,000		
Fire-Department HQ ¹		\$35,000	\$40,000	\$100,000	
Fire-Hydrant Replacement ²		\$50,000	\$50,000		
East Lexington Fire Station			\$47,500		
Wireless Fire Alarms		\$142,000			
Munroe Center Evaluation		\$35,000			
Munroe Fire-Protection System ³			\$579,550		
Fire-Monitoring of Historic Houses		\$18,120			
Police & Fire/EMS Mobile Computerization ⁴			\$156,000		
Self Contained Breathing Apparatus					\$260,000
Fire HQ Alarm Receiver					\$30,000
Totals	\$380,000	\$360,120	\$1,073,050	\$600,000	\$290,000

Notes

¹ Women's Shower (FY2008); Redesign Study (FY2009 & 2010 [includes \$29,700 CPF])² Includes \$25,000 each year from Water Enterprise Fund³ CPF (Ultimately completed for \$345,325)⁴ Joint with Police (shown in both departments)**Police**

The Lexington Police Department, which provides public safety services through a team of dedicated police officers, detectives, dispatchers and support staff, is supported by the Town's Capital Program in the areas of communication systems, computer systems, and improvements to the facility in which it is housed.

A professional-services contract was awarded on February 19, 2010, to Donham & Sweeney Architects (D&SA), as authorized by the 2009 ATM approval of Article 11(g), to conduct a space-needs study of how to better to preserve and renovate the Police Department Headquarters in light of how it is staffed today and the Department's current and future mission requirements. The D&SA report indicated that the structure of the existing building could not be altered in anyway without "triggering" the latest Seismic Code requirements, which would require major structural alterations. The preliminary study, completed in November, 2010, suggested the ideal solution would be essentially to double the existing square footage by extending the building into the existing parking lot at the rear of the Police Station.

We note that the proposed 5-Year Capital Plan does not contain any project(s) for improving the existing facility, although it does include a software improvement project for Police & Fire Departments in FY2016.

Police Department 5-Year Capital Appropriation History (All Funding Sources)

	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Dispatch Room Renovation ¹	\$842,000				
Police & Fire/EMS Mobile Computerization ²			\$156,000		
Police Station Space Preservation & Needs Study				\$45,000	
Police Station Ventilation System ³					\$31,700

Notes

¹ Includes \$100,000 from CPF² Joint with Fire (shown in both departments)

Library

Under DPF management, with funding appropriated at last-year's Town Meeting (\$25,000 under Article 12(q)), a contract was awarded to Adams & Smiths Architects on December 2, 2010. The effort, for the Cary Memorial Library, is to review the existing conditions regarding the handling of the bins of library materials that Circulation processes each day from the book drop and interlibrary loans and the Bibliographic Services, and to recommend solutions. The goal is more efficient patron service through electronic tagging and better ergonomics for department employees. A meaningful progress report is expected around the end of this month. Based on it, DPF expects to bring to this Town Meeting information on the path contemplated provide solutions to the Library's problems. Funding is being requested to design the recommended solutions. (See Article 13(l))

Public Works

The Department of Public Works (DPW) is the maintenance agent for all Town facilities with the exception of buildings, which are assigned, to the Department of Public Facilities (DPF), and is responsible for the execution (i.e., design, bidding, construction, and project management) of related DPW projects. To accomplish its mission, the DPW is organized around seven elements: Administration and Engineering, Highway Division, Public Grounds Division, Environmental Services Division, Transportation Services Office, Water Division, and Sewer Division.

Major components of DPW's FY2012-FY2016 capital projects include:

- Trucks and heavy equipment necessary to accomplish DPW missions,
- Road and sidewalk construction,
- Water-distribution and wastewater systems improvements,
- Traffic control and mitigation,
- Storm-water control and management, and
- Public-grounds improvements

Almost all construction projects for the wastewater (sanitary sewer) system and for the water-distribution system are funded from Enterprise Funds. Likewise, large trucks and heavy equipment used in support of the wastewater and water-distribution systems are funded by Enterprise Funds. The rest of DPW's capital needs, except CPA-funded projects, must be funded by the general tax levy and/or debt-exclusion votes..

Roads

Lexington has a total of about 201 miles of roads, including State and unaccepted roads. That total consists of 138 miles of public roadway, 17 miles of unaccepted roadway and 46 State highway miles—all numbers approximate. Lexington's DPW maintains about 126 miles of roadway; the remainder being maintained by the State or private owners. The estimated replacement cost of the 138 miles of public roadways is \$85 million, in FY2011 dollars.

Funding for roads is a combination of State Chapter 90 funds (typically expected at the about \$700,000 level) and Town funds at least in the amount of the \$500,000 set-aside established in the FY2001 operating override. (The \$500,000 set-aside has been increased by 2.5% [i.e., the statutory growth in the tax levy] each year beginning with FY2008.) (See Article 10(j))

In April 2010, the Town retained Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST), a civil engineering consulting firm, to develop and implement a Pavement Management System (PMS) for its public roadways and its bike trail (approximately 5 miles). The study was completed in November 2010. This Committee is extremely pleased to see that study and that it provides a quantitative basis for the condition of the pavements that the DPW maintains. That information, along with recognition of pending associated impacts on our pavements (e.g., cuts for utilities work, construction for storm-water and wastewater system improvements, sidewalk-related projects, etc.) offers the promise of an even-more productive and

cost-effective program going forward. We also appreciated that the new study made use of the data from the previously-funded pavement-condition-index software.

The comprehensive study developed an extensive roadway database describing actual pavement conditions and roadway characteristics in order to better understand future roadway-funding requirements. FST engineers surveyed all of our roadways and recorded roadway physical characteristics (e.g., cracking, potholes, distortion, etc.). Then, using the Cartêgraph Systems, Inc., computer program PAVEMENTview[®] Plus, FST computed a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for each inventoried, surfaced, public roadway in Lexington. A PCI of 100 would apply to a newly constructed roadway without any problems and a PCI of zero would apply to a roadway that was unusable. The 100-point scale is broken down into 5 bands: “Do Nothing” band (PCIs of 88–100), “Routine Maintenance” band (PCIs of 68–87), “Preventive Maintenance” band (PCIs of 47–67), “Structural Improvement” band (PCIs of 21–46), and “Base Rehabilitation” band (PCIs of 0–20).

FST identified 563 pavement-management segments and determined that the Town’s average roadway PCI, in the fall of 2010, was 68. This rating puts the typical road condition at the very bottom of the “Routine Maintenance” band. An average road condition in the bottom of the Routine Maintenance treatment band means that considerable resources will be needed to sustain network wide conditions. The funding required to bring all roadways up to a PCI average of 88 (bottom of “Do Nothing” band) is called the Backlog. For Lexington to immediately erase its backlog, the Town would have to appropriate approximately \$18.3 million, less any Chapter 90 funds, in FY2012. Since this is unrealistic, FST developed 5 possible scenarios for funding over each of the next 10 years. (In each case, the dollar amounts are total; not net of any contribution of Chapter 90 funding.)

If the Town spends no money for road repairs for 10 years, the average PCI will drop to 28.4 (i.e., bottom of the “Structural Improvement” band) and the backlog will approach \$159 million.

If the Town continues to spend about \$1.25 million per year on the worst roads, the PCI level will drop to 40.7 and the backlog will increase to \$103.5 million.

However, by prioritizing “good” roads and doing nothing to the current “worst” roads, the continued expenditure of \$1.25 million per year would keep the average PCI above 64, but the backlog would increase only to \$65 million.

In the scenario which keeps the backlog at less than \$21 million, it would be necessary to spend \$31 million over the next ten years—rather than continuing the current rate which would total \$12.5 million.

There is also an aggressive funding scenario where the Town would increase funding to \$3.25 million per year for four years and then reduce funding to \$1.5 million for the next 6 years. This scenario increases the PCI Level to 85.4—an improvement to just short of the “Do Nothing” band. It would also keep the backlog below \$21 million.

The FST study clearly indicates that unless there is far greater funding for street improvements in our budget, the roadways in Lexington will deteriorate to an undesirable and unsafe condition. If there is not an immediate, and continuing, increase in funding, the cost to address the backlog (i.e., the funding necessary to bring all roadway conditions up to being in the “Do Nothing” [excellent condition] band), in 2021, could grow to as high as \$104 million.

With regard to the Chapter 90 funding, there is a glimmer of hope for some additional assistance from that source. Although at the time of this report the State’s legislature (the General Court of Massachusetts) has not weighed in with its decision, the FY2012 budget proposed by the Governor includes a 29% increase in the Chapter 90 funding. (It adds \$45 million to bring it to an all-time high of \$200 million.) If that increase should prevail—which won’t be known until after Town Meeting must decide upon our budget—and the existing formulas for distribution to each municipality, which have been tweaked each year, don’t change materially, Lexington’s share would be about \$930,000. Such a \$230,000 increase from the estimate being used in our budget would offer the Town the opportunity to provide some relief to the tax-levy contribution to the routine street-improvements effort under this sub-Article; however, as noted above, even such a substantial increase in the State’s contribution, pales in

comparison to the funding needed to ensure our roadway infrastructure is restored to the level this Town has come to expect.

Traffic Mitigation

Traffic Mitigation is the phrase applied to projects designed to improve traffic safety, traffic flow—and reduce impacts on neighbors—through accumulation of traffic data, and the design and construction of new infrastructure and improvements.

The FY2012 request for Townwide Signalization Improvements provides for updated pedestrian signals at the Bedford Street/Hill Street/Revere Street intersection. (See Article 10(m)) There is also a project for a South Lexington Transportation Master Plan. (See Article 10(i)) A third project in the Traffic Mitigation area provides for installation of a high-visibility pedestrian crossing on Waltham Street in the vicinity of the Brookhaven at Lexington continuing-care retirement community. (See Article 10(n))

Sidewalks

Currently the town has more than 62-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. That committee's overall policy is to develop a prioritized sidewalk construction plan focusing on the Safe Routes to School Program, other high-pedestrian-traffic routes and high-walking-hazard streets.

The FY2012 funding request for accomplishing work under that plan includes constructing new sidewalks and rebuilding/repaving existing sidewalks. (See Article 10(d))

Public Grounds

The Town has approximately 630 acres of land in a total of 110 parks, playgrounds, conservation areas, athletic facilities, school grounds and historical sites. In addition, Town staff administers and maintains four cemeteries with a combined area of a little over 30 acres. The Forestry staff maintains approximately 10,000 trees along roadways and an indeterminate number of trees, shrubs and plantings on Town-owned land.

The FY2012 funding request will provide for an expansion of the irrigation system at Westview Cemetery. (See Article 10(k))

Minuteman Bikeway

The 11-mile Minuteman Bikeway, which was opened in 1993, runs from the Alewife MBTA Station to the railroad Freight House in Bedford. About half the total length of the Bikeway, or 5.5 miles, lies in Lexington. The DPW's Public Grounds Division maintains the Lexington segment.

The 5-Year Capital Plan carries no capital projects related to the Bikeway.

Water Distribution System

Many of the Town's water mains were installed in the early 1900s and need to be replaced or cleaned and lined. For a number of years, the Town has been systematically improving the system in order to improve water quality, pressure, and fire-protection capabilities, and to reduce frequency and severity of water-main breaks.

Since DPW already has available funding for two or three year of construction work, there is no a funds request in FY2012. However, funding requests are anticipated each year during the balance of the 5-Year Capital Plan.

To improve meter-reading efficiencies, the Town is considering installing an Automatic Water-Meter Reading System based on the results of a study funded by the 2009 Annual Town Meeting (described

there under Articles 16(b) & 17(c); funded there under Article 5). Funding for Phase 1, of a 3-phase implementation plan, was included in the FY2011 capital budget, but as that study had not been fully vetted, Town Meeting Indefinitely Postponed the Article. Funding for Phase 1 will not be requested in the FY2012 budget since the Town Manager deferred the project.

Fire Hydrant System

The Town of Lexington has approximately 1,500 hydrants in its fire-protection system. To maintain an effective system, approximately 25 hydrants must be replaced every year.

Costs for hydrant replacement are evenly divided between Tax Levy funds and Water Enterprise Funds. (See Article 10(h))

Dam Repair

The State Department of Conservation and Recreation mandates inspection every three years of dams that are rated significant hazard dams. The Butterfield Dam on Lowell Street is one such dam. The inspection in FY2011 led to the proposed capital project. (See Article 10(a))

Pedestrian Signal Improvements

Many of the Town's pedestrian signals at street crossings are outdated and, sometimes, malfunctioning.

FY2012 request for Town wide Signalization Improvements provides for updated pedestrian signals at Bedford Street/Hill Street/Revere Street intersection. (See Article 10(m)) There is also a project in the Traffic Mitigation arena that provides for installation of a high visibility pedestrian crossing on Waltham Street in the vicinity of Brookhaven. (See Article 10(n))

Storm-Water Drainage System

Storm drains which line the Town's streets occasionally fail due to heavy loads passing over them and/or loss of supporting soil around them, creating holes in the street. In addition, 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 drains where overflow conditions develop and/or complaints are received.

The FY2012 request funds such repairs and, also, works toward compliance with new Storm water Phase II regulations, which require increased monitoring and testing of storm water. (See Article 10(c))

Storm Water Management

State Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regulations require the Town to maintain its 18 brooks, three watersheds, and its numerous wetlands in a condition such that they do not reduce the volume of water that can be handled by our storm-drainage systems. Sediment and broken tree limbs impede the flow of water and cause flooding and damage to private property, thus creating liabilities for the Town.

The FY2012 request is to begin the design of improvements to the Charles River Watershed as recommended in the engineer's report submitted at the end of phase one of the three-phase watershed study funded in FY2010 (described there under Articles 15(c)). (See Article 10(l))

Wastewater System

The wastewater (sanitary-sewer) system, like the water-distribution system, has sections that date back to the early 1900s. Due to age-related deterioration, some sections are susceptible to storm-water infiltration and with deficient pumping causing overloading of parts of the system. There is an ongoing program of replacing and repairing sections of the system.

Requested funding in FY2012 will allow for continued Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) investigation and removal which includes smoke testing, TV inspection, sealing of pipes and manholes, open-cut replacement, and pipelining (see Article 11(a)) and improvements to, and rehabilitation of, two small Pump Stations (see Article 11(b)).

Because wastewater costs are related to water consumption, the Sewer Department would be sharing the cost of an Automatic Water-Meter Reading System; however, as noted above under Water Distribution System, funding for this project has been deferred by the Town Manager.

DPW Equipment

DPW equipment has approximately 160 pieces of equipment. Of those, 100 pieces had an individual acquisition cost in excess of \$25,000; therefore, their replacement would normally be subject to this Committee's review. The total acquisition cost of the 160 pieces was approximately \$6.8 million and their replacement today is estimated to cost around \$11 million. DPW has developed a well-conceived program of replacing the older, less fuel-efficient and high-maintenance-cost equipment with standard, off-the-shelf vehicles and equipment that will last longer and cost less to maintain and operate. Equipment owned, operated, and maintained by DPW includes: autos, dump trucks, sanders, cranes, trailers, pickups, loaders, rollers, backhoes, tractor-mounted snow throwers, sweepers, brush chippers, mowers, sprayers, vacuums, compressors, welders, portable generators, pumps, lifts, and compactors. Equipment with acquisition costs under \$25,000 is funded with operating funds. The current 5-year equipment-replacement schedule projects annual costs of about \$500,000 per year, in 2011 dollars.

The FY2012 program, which replaces a tractor with a snow blower and mower attachments, a slice seeder, an aerator, a mower with collection system, a street sweeper, and a 10-wheel dump truck used by the Water Division, is consistent with the 5-year replacement schedule. In addition to the replacement vehicles, the Public Grounds Division will procure a utility cart, with attachments. (See Article 10(b))

New DPW Facility

See below, under Public Services Building, for the discussion of this facility.

DPW 5-Year Capital Appropriation History (All Funding Sources)

	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Capital from Tax Levy & Chapter 90 Funds[†]					
DPW Equipment	\$485,000	\$523,300	\$510,000	\$520,923	\$400,384
DPW Facility	\$1,300,000	\$25,480,000			
Street resurfacing & reconstruction	\$960,000	\$1,320,000	\$1,925,000	\$1,238,125	\$1,376,578
Street light/traffic mitigation		\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$217,000
Drains/dams/brook cleaning	\$160,000	\$460,000	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$270,000
Town Building Envelope	\$90,000	\$150,000			
Sidewalk/bikeway improvements	\$300,000	\$350,000	\$275,000		\$340,000
Geographic Information System				\$84,000	
Street Acceptance—Pitcairn Place				\$125,000	
Comprehensive Watershed Study				\$110,000	\$110,000
Hydrant Replacement		\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Totals	\$3,295,000	\$28,358,300	\$2,945,000	\$2,313,048	\$2,738,962

[†] FY2009 was the first year that Capital Projects for both Municipal and School facilities were submitted by the then-new Department of Public Facilities. See the Public Facilities Appropriation History later in this report for its FY2009–FY2011 appropriations—which includes items for the Municipal & School Facilities.

Capital from Enterprise Funds**Wastewater**

Sewer System	\$300,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	
DPW Equipment				\$263,500	\$45,000
Geographic Information System		\$102,300	\$22,122	\$14,400	
Automatic Water-Meter Reading System				\$25,000	
Pump station upgrades		\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Sewer Totals	\$300,000	\$1,502,300	\$1,322,122	\$1,602,900	\$145,000

Water

Water Mains Relining	\$900,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	\$900,000	\$900,000
DPW Equipment				\$119,000	\$57,420
Water Meters ^{††}	\$500,000			\$25,000	
Geographic Information System		\$31,210	\$33,183	\$21,600	
Hydrant Replacement		\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000
Rehabilitate Standpipes					\$160,000
Water Totals	\$1,400,000	\$1,856,210	\$1,858,183	\$1,090,600	\$1,142,420

^{††}The first expense funded the at-site remote-reading of water meters; the second, the half-funding of the study for remote, automatic reading of water meters. (See the above table for the Wastewater EF which funded the other half of the study.)

Public Services Building

Construction of a new DPW Facility at 201 Bedford Street, site of the former DPW Facility, was authorized on June 5, 2007, by a favorable vote on a debt-exclusion referendum. The originally intended design was modified slightly to accommodate the newly formed Department of Public Facilities (DPF) and thus became the Public Services Building (PSB), with an associated sand-and-salt storage building at the rear of the site and additional storage.

DPF was responsible for managing the construction of this new joint-use facility. The building was completed in Spring 2009 and was dedicated and occupied in the summer of 2009. It was named after Samuel Hadley—which continues the Town's tradition of honoring heroes of the Revolutionary War. (Samuel Hadley having been one of those 8 killed on April 9, 1775, when the British Army Regulars and the American Colonial Militia exchanged gunfire on the Town's Green at the start of that War.)

All the work has been completed and while final accounting is still pending, the project will come in at least \$2.2 million under the \$27.5 million budget. On December 16, 2010, the facility was certified as

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

meeting the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System™ Silver standards for environmental, economic, and occupant-oriented performance.

This Committee offers kudos to the DPF, DPW, and the Permanent Building Committee for their efforts in the design and construction this facility.

Public Facilities

The Department of Public Facilities (DPF) is responsible for the coordination and care of all Town-owned buildings inclusive of those under the control of the Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Library Trustees, and School Committee. Costs associated with the staffing, maintenance (including preventative maintenance), custodial services, capital-project management, utilities, landscaping and grounds (at schools only), and building rentals are contained within this department. The DPF's Project Management Division is responsible for major capital renovations and providing staff support to the Permanent Building Committee for new construction.

DPF is responsible for 26 buildings: Town Office Building, Cary Hall, Police Station, Fire Department Headquarters, East Lexington Fire Station, PSB, Stone Building (previously used as the East Lexington Library), Cary Memorial Library, Visitors Center, Council on Aging Facility (Senior Center in the Muzzey Condominiums, 1475 Massachusetts Avenue), Westview Cemetery, the "White House", 13 buildings at the 9 schools (the Lexington High School complex has 5 buildings), and the Schools Administration (in the old Harrington School).

DPF has taken a systematic approach to solving problems that affect both Municipal and School buildings, including roofs, flooring, and building envelope. Funding for such Capital repairs is contained in the 5-year Capital Expenditures program. During FY2011, DPF refined its estimates for these programs, which in some cases might be more on-going maintenance than capital expenditures. However, since the needs exist and the work will be funded by Tax Levy dollars, the Capital Expenditures Committee supports these projects being in the FY2012 Capital Budget—although we would look for them to transition into the Operating Budget.

The FY2012 General Fund program provides for repair, maintenance, design and/or construction through 12 sub-articles for Town buildings. (See Article 13) In addition, one project funded from the CPF would be executed by the DPF. (See Article 8(b)).

Public Facilities 5-Year Capital Appropriation History (General Fund Sources)[†]

Program	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
<u>Municipal</u>					
Building Envelope			\$153,750	\$157,594	\$161,534
Munroe School Fire Protection			\$579,550		
Fire HQ D&E Study			\$40,000	\$70,300	
East Lexington Fire Station Kitchen Upgrade				\$75,000	
Town Ofc Bldg Renovation					\$325,000
<u>Schools</u>					
Building Envelope			\$265,000	\$376,500	\$272,400
Mechanical/Elec/Plumbing			\$1,340,000	\$390,000	\$50,000
Landscaping/Paving			\$65,000	\$120,000	\$175,000
Interior Renovations			\$365,000	\$305,000	\$174,000
Bridge/Bownman D&E					\$750,000
School Improvements					\$378,000
Totals			\$2,808,300	\$1,494,394	\$2,285,934

[†]FY2009 was the first year that Capital Projects for both Municipal and School facilities were submitted by the then-new Department of Public Facilities. Previous facilities' Capital Projects were presented separately by the DPW and the Schools—and are still shown in their Appropriation Histories.

Recreation

The Recreation programs in the FY2012 budget have three funding sources: CPF for projects that meet the criterion for protection of a recreation resource, Recreation EF for fee-based program facilities, and tax levy for a non-fee-based community facilities such as neighborhood playgrounds.

The second phase of the Drainage Implementation Plan for the Center Playfields complex seeks Community Preservation Funding under Article 8(g) this year and Phase III in FY2013 (estimated at \$605,718) would complete the project. This large Drainage project will restore, progressively, most play fields in the 23-acre site to a much higher standard of use and playability. The last phase would address the Little League/Jr. Varsity Softball field, practice-field area, and the parking lot. Total project cost remains at \$2.39 million, largely devoted to construction.

In Article 9, funds are being requested from the Recreation EF for Phase II of renovations at the Irving H. Mabee Pool Complex as the swimming program is fee-based. Phase II addresses interior repairs and renovations to enhance environmental and energy efficiencies. The last phase of the pool project will replace the present filtration system and require additional building space to house a fourth filtration system (projected to cost \$1,120,000 in FY2016).

The third project, in Article 10(o), requests tax-levy funding for the renovations of the field behind the Franklin Housing complex. This continues a yearly renewal of neighborhood programs with out-year projects being as follows: The proposed renovation schedule is FY2013—Irrigation improvements at Garfield Park and additional irrigation at Diamond and Clarke Fields (\$50,000); FY2014—Replace surface Field 1 at Lincoln Park and possibly Estabrook, which was deleted from this year's projects, for \$200,000; FY2015—Field 2 at Lincoln Park and Fields at Southland (\$200,000); [and] FY 2016—Center Track field area and #3 field at Lincoln Park. Additional tax-levy funded is slated for resurfacing the Center track FY2013 (\$110,000); Ringe and Marvin basketball re-surfacing in FY2016. The remaining resurfacing project is for \$75,000 in FY2015 for the Gallagher Tennis Courts and Clarke tennis courts will ask for Recreation Enterprise funds.

Athletic field lighting will be addressed in two phases. In FY2013, energy-efficient lighting structures will replace present Gallagher tennis court lights from the Recreation EF (\$172,927) and on Center Basketball Courts from tax levy (\$96,542). In FY2015, Phase II lighting Plan is to replace the Center #2 Varsity Softball structure (\$172,926) and Center #1 Varsity Baseball field structure (\$286,433), both tax levy with a 25-year warranty and maintenance plan.

Pine Meadows has a regular equipment-replacement program for the heavily used specialized mowers and aerators, all funded from Recreation EF. In FY2013, a Toro or Jacobsen 3400 Mower Replacement used for green's work is expected to cost \$42,000. In FY2015, a Toro Grounds Master 4500D mower for cutting the rough replaces the present model for \$52,000, and in FY2016, Toro Workman Utility vehicle costing \$20,000 and a Toro Aerator for \$25,000 will replace present models. In addition, Phase II of the dam restoration and drainage project (Phase I now complete) is slated for FY2014 for \$259,000 from the Recreation EF. Included will be regrading the fairways and adding drainage at the 1st, 2nd, and 8th holes.

Recreation 5-Year Capital Appropriation History (All Funding Sources)

Program	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Athletic Fields		\$50,000	\$177,000	\$70,000	\$50,000
Playgrounds & Tot Lots	\$225,000		\$75,000		
Golf Course	\$25,000			\$200,000	
Swimming (Old Res & Center) [†]	\$50,000		\$60,000	\$569,000	\$25,000
Tennis & Basketball		\$235,000	\$60,000		
Center Playfields Drainage					\$875,173
Totals	\$300,000	\$285,000	\$372,000	\$839,000	\$950,173

[†]\$20,000 of the FY2009 appropriation was not used as the FY2010 appropriation incorporated that same scope.

Schools

Overview

The Lexington Public Schools provide educational, athletic, and club activities for 6,340 students in grades K–12. Pre-school programs are also offered at the elementary schools. Enrollment figures are those as of October 1st as required by the State’s Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for each academic year. For October 1, 2010, in the six elementary schools there were 2,830 students, in the two middle schools the total was 1,515, and the high-school number was 1,995.

In addition to the six elementary-school buildings, and two middle-school buildings, the high school is a complex of four, free-standing, academic buildings and a field house. Central Office (“Administration”) personnel and services are located in what had been the old Harrington School. These fourteen buildings are overseen by the DPF.

School Technology Program

There is a long-term plan to upgrade technology throughout the schools by replacing the oldest computers, peripherals, projection systems, network-delivery systems, and other associated hardware and software. This year’s request continues the annual requests in support of that plan. (See Article 12(a))

Equipment

Food-service operations in all schools serve hot and cold meals to thousands of students each school day. It is essential to purchase and maintain equipment for preparing and maintaining cooked items and that provides for safe distribution. The food-service operations are contracted to a private vendor, but the purchase of equipment is the responsibility of the school system. (See Article 12(b))

Furnishings in buildings that are not new or renovated are updated on a revolving basis as part of an annual request. (See Article 12(c))

School 5-Year Capital Appropriation History (All Funding Sources)[†]

Program	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Technology	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$696,000
Classroom Furniture		\$50,000	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$58,571
Miscellaneous	\$1,656,000	\$230,000			
Pre-K–12 Master Plan			\$155,000		
Food Service Equipment			\$55,000	\$75,000	\$99,500
Secondary Schools		\$1,885,000			
Elementary Schools	\$200,000	\$445,000			
Time Clock/Time Reporting System					\$97,000
Totals	\$2,256,000	\$3,010,000	\$835,000	\$725,000	\$951,071

[†] FY2009 was the first year that Capital Projects for both Municipal and School facilities were submitted by the then-new Department of Public Facilities. See the Public Facilities Appropriation History earlier in this report for its FY2009 & FY2010 appropriations—which includes items for the Municipal & Schools facilities.

Information Technology (IT) Infrastructure (Town-wide)

That IT infrastructure—which supports Municipal and Schools functions—includes both physical and software elements, and is crucial to the everyday operations of the Town. There are two requests for capital upgrades to that infrastructure. (See Articles 10(f), & (g))

Warrant Article Analysis and Recommendations

The cites to the “Brown Book” refer to the “Town of Lexington Fiscal Year 2012 Recommended Budget & Financing Plan”, February 28, 2011.

<i>Article 7 (3rd Fund Only): Establish and Continue Departmental Revolving Funds— DPW Compost Operations</i>	Fund Authorization Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$115,000 (out of total of \$499,000)	DPW Compost Operations RF	Approval (5–0)

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Authorization Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
<i>(a) Culvert Replacement</i>	\$65,000	DPW Compost Operations RF	Approval (5–0)

“The three corrugated metal pipe arch culverts under the access road to the Hartwell Avenue Compost Facility have failed due to rust and separation at the pipe connection joints. Significant sinkholes have developed in the roadway as a result. Replacing these pipe culverts will allow for continuous and safe access to the compost facility as well as proper storm water flow through the culverts. This request is for survey, design and permitting of the repairs....” [Brown Book, Page XI-15]

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Authorization Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
<i>(b) Compost Facility Green Waste (Anaerobic Facility) Study</i>	\$52,000	DPW Compost Operations RF	Approval (5–0)

“The Board of Selectmen has requested staff to assess the Hartwell Avenue compost site as a location for a privately operated “green waste” processing facility. Such an operation, through a process known as anaerobic digestion, would convert green waste (food stuffs and vegetative matter) into energy and compost.” [Brown Book, Page XI-15]

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

We have the following as the breakdown of the costs for the requested authorization:

Estimate for Engineering and Legal Services for Anaerobic Digester Facility at Hartwell Avenue Site		
Estimated Cost		
1	Mass DEP Permitting	\$ 8,000
2	Field Investigation	
3	Survey	\$ 7,000
4	Wetland Delineation	\$ 4,000
5	Subsurface Analysis	\$ 5,000
6	Draft RFP/Special Legal Services	\$ 18,000
7	Public Meetings	\$ 5,000
8	Evaluate Proposals / Contract Negotiations	\$ 5,000
9	Est. Total	\$ 52,000

Comments Applicable to Both Efforts

As this annual Article only provides the required authorization for revolving funds, this Committee normally would not comment on it; however, as the Town intends to pay for these two capital projects from a revolving fund, we believe these projects should be handled like other capital projects—which includes our review and recommendation to Town Meeting—and be subject to explicit Town Meeting review and approval. Therefore, we recommend these projects be explicitly described to Town Meeting so, if needed, they can be further discussed before a vote is taken—either on the whole Article or on this one RF, if separated-out.

Article 8: Appropriate the FY2012 Community Preservation Committee Operating Budget and CPA Projects (Multiple Categories)	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$4,491,867	\$4,274,982 CPF (Cash) + \$216,885 GF (Cash)	(See below)

Project Description(CPA Category)	Amount Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
(a) Archives & Records Management/Conservation (Historic Resources)	\$150,000	CPF (Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This is the fourth year request for a 5-year program of conservation and preservation of historic municipal documents and records. It will continue the proper retention and archiving of vital records created by municipal departments with microfilming and digitization for ready access. The request for FY12 includes significant items from the Assessor and Town Clerk collections that are at risk for damage and loss. Additional work to microfilm bulky permanent records is also planned. The request includes provision of hardware/software as needed for electronic document management, in addition to microfilming, scanning, preservation and conservation.” [Brown Book, Page XI-16].

Project Description(CPA Category)	Amount Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
(b) East Lexington Fire Equipment Doors Replacement (Historic Resources)	\$60,000	CPF (Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“The door openings at the East Lexington Fire Station need to be enlarged to improve fire operations. Today’s larger fire vehicles have a close tolerance to the door openings, and the potential exists for

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

damage to the building and equipment, or delay in department response to an incident. This is a proactive measure to prevent further damage or interference with department operations. The project will be implemented in two phases. The first phase will be to develop a design that enlarges the door openings in a manner consistent with the historic character of the building and the second phase will be the implementation of the approved modifications.” [Brown Book, Page XI-12].

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(c) Leary Property Planning Funds (Community Housing)	\$30,000	CPF (Cash)	Disapproval (5–0)

“The Ad Hoc Leary Property Community Housing Task Force has recommended to the Board of Selectmen that \$30,000 be requested to prepare an affordable housing development proposal for the site at 116 Vine Street. Approval of these funds would enable the Task Force to continue public outreach and pre-development activities such as architectural and engineering work, production of plans and specifications, and program development. The Task Force expects to explore a range of construction funding, including a future application for CPA funds, but the Task Force needs to define its program prior to applying for affordable housing production grants from the State. Ultimately the group envisions that a local non-profit developer will handle the long-term operation and maintenance of the property, and that revenues generated by the property will be sufficient to sustain the project without needing infusions of new capital.” [Brown Book, Page XI-16].

Lexington has long relied upon the Lexington Housing Assistance Board (LexHAB), under the authority of the Board of Selectmen (BoS), to provide for, and manage, the Town’s affordable housing stock. Before looking elsewhere—through the means of a development proposal or Request for Information (RFI) requiring this additional funding—it needs to be made clear why LexHAB cannot be the developer of the housing on the Town-owned land that was the Leary Property and pursue the RFI—with the advice and counsel of the Task Force—which would obviate the need for this funding as LexHAB should cover any such costs from within its own assets. (At the BoS’ meeting on March 14, 2011, it was stated that LexHAB has already committed to funding \$10,000 toward the on-going effort to define what should be the housing recommended for this parcel of land and LexHAB representatives said they were willing and able to be the lead on the development.) We recognize that the Task Force provides advice to the BoS and that LexHAB must obtain that Board’s approval before it can execute any production of housing; therefore, in the end, it is the BoS which will judge the merits of whatever development proposal is fashioned, regardless by whom.

Therefore, in absence of a proposal for production of affordable housing on that Town-owned land by LexHAB and leaving to LexHAB—with the advice and counsel of the Task Force—to issue any Request for Information, this Committee recommends disapproval of this sub-element even if the dollar amount were lower than the current request.

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(d) LexHAB—Set-Aside for Housing Acquisition (Community Housing)	\$450,000	CPF (Cash)	Approval as conditioned below (5–0)

“LexHAB is requesting ‘up-front’ funds from the CPA fund in order to purchase affordable housing units in a cost-effective manner. To date, LexHAB purchases a unit, applies to the CPC for funding, and then must wait until July 1 until funds become available. This delay results in the necessity for two closings, duplicative legal fees, lost rental income, and unnecessary payment of interest costs. Providing LexHAB with funds prior to purchase saves LexHAB and the Town considerable money and staff time. The funds for this article to support community housing would be held by the Town, and bills would be submitted

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

for payment, similar to all CPC and Town Meeting approved projects. The CPC is recommending this funding to Town Meeting subject to agreed standards for the purchase or creation of new housing units.” [Brown Book, Page XI-16].

This Committee supports this alternate approach to providing CPF funding to LexHAB to further Lexington’s community (affordable) housing objective under the CPA. As we discussed with the proponent, we expect the presentation to Town Meeting under this sub-element to provide evidence of where the procedural changes under this alternate approach have been shown to achieve the stated efficiencies in other municipalities.

This Committee has a formal responsibility to advise Town Meeting on all uses of the CPF, and as the provision of these funds is absent information on the specific projects on which these funds will be used, this Committee finds it is important that two conditions shall apply to this appropriation: (1) The “Guidelines for Use of CPA Funding Under Article 8d for Acquisition of Affordable Housing Units by LexHAB” (as approved by the CPC at their meeting, March 17, 2011) shall be explicitly incorporated—at least by reference—in the Motion for this set-aside; and (2) That this Committee’s advice, along with that of the CPC, shall be considered by the Board of Selectmen when it is approached by LexHAB for the required Board’s approval of any such specific project that proposes to use any of the funds from this set-aside. (The review by this Committee, the CPC, and even the Board of Selectmen, could be accomplished in a joint meeting so as not to materially delay that Board’s ability to make a timely decision.)

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(e) Battle Green Monument Restoration (Historic Resources)	\$50,000	CPF (Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This project will rehabilitate and repair existing monuments in Town in preparation for the Town’s 300th year celebration in 2013. Monuments to be restored and repaired include the Obelisk, Minuteman Statue, Minuteman Monument, and the Common flagpole. A conservator will be hired to assist and oversee the necessary work. The monuments will be checked for structural integrity and will be repaired and restored to proper finish. This project will preserve monuments to Lexington’s history for both Lexington residents and tourists visiting the Town.” [Brown Book, Page XI-14].

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(f) Battle Green Master Plan Implementation (Historic Resources)	\$50,000	CPF (Cash)	Approval (3–2)

“A Master Plan for the Battle Green is being prepared for the Selectmen’s approval. This plan will call for the coordinated stewardship of this important Lexington resource, and will recommend site improvements including comprehensive programming for lighting, interpretation, path surfaces, parking, pedestrian access, monument preservation and plantings. While the details of the Master Plan are still being reviewed, the Master Plan Committee is seeking funding for initial work on the pathways leading to the monuments on the Green. The funding estimate for this historic preservation project is \$48,000 for restoration work with a \$2,000 contingency. Additional funding may be requested in subsequent years for this historic preservation project, depending upon available matching state, federal, and private grant funds.” [Brown Book, Page XI-16]

Notwithstanding the title of this sub-element and that Article 34 of this Meeting will be Indefinitely Postponed (see this Committee’s position on it on Page 58), but as recognized in the above description of the purpose of this requested funding, this funding—which is in conjunction with that proposed under sub-element (e)—is for initial work related to the monuments on the Battle Green.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

The minority on this Committee is opposed to including the restoration of the fountain in the Hayes (Minuteman) statue (\$15,000) at this time as they do not believe there has been sufficient Town-wide discussion on the merits of doing that work. As we're told that work is severable from the other work being done on that statue—and doing it later would not materially affect the estimated cost—we believe the fountain work should be brought back to a later Town Meeting for consideration, if there are still proponents, at that time, for it to be done.

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(g) Center Playfields Drainage – Phase II (Recreational Use)	\$911,863	CPF (Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“The Center Playfields Complex is the most heavily used Recreation complex in the Town. It is used by the schools, adult and youth leagues and the general public. The entire 23-acre area has very poor drainage conditions resulting in standing water, soft field areas, and reduced turf cover and quality which lead to unsafe and unplayable conditions. Funds requested for FY12 are the second phase of a three year project projected to cost \$2.39 million. Work in this phase will implement drainage and grading improvements on the football field and JV baseball field areas to move water off the fields and allow them to dry faster. Funding for the remaining field areas and parking lot will be requested in FY13.” [Brown Book, Page XI-15]

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(h) Muzzey High Condo Association—Window Replacement (Historic Resources)	\$0	CPF (Cash)	Indefinite Postponement (5–0)

“This project involves the replacement of windows on the former Muzzey Junior High School building on Massachusetts Avenue, which is in the Munroe Tavern Historic District. Windows owned by the residents of the Muzzey Condominium Association are in need of replacement due to energy inefficiency and widespread deterioration, and the Historic Districts Commission has approved the Association's plan for total replacement with windows which cost \$2,855 per window -- a substantial premium over the more affordable \$931 per window for modern vinyl windows. The Association is seeking to mitigate this difference in cost for approximately 137 windows. The Association feels this is necessary since many residents are on limited fixed incomes, substantially below the area-wide median income level, and have had to face \$300,837 in capital improvements to the building in the last two years. The CPC has approved this request, with the stipulation that the monies appropriated in this grant be returned to the Town upon sale of individual units.” [Brown Book, Page XI-17].

On March 15, 2011, the applicant withdrew its request (which was for \$253,915, to which \$20,000 had been added to cover the anticipated Town’s legal expenses as it was to be a loan) as it is negotiating an alternate process with the Board of Selectmen whereby the owners will be able to add the total cost of the replacement windows specified by the Historic District Commission (HDC) to the capped sale price of the unit; therefore, the Motion under this sub-element will be for Indefinite Postponement.

However, as the CPC had voted to support the request to Town Meeting, this Committee believes it is important to be on record why it was unanimously opposed to that request.

On the surface, the request may have appeared as a compassionate accommodation to an extra burden that is placed on the unit owners, as well as their condominium association, by being in one of Lexington’s historic districts and, thereby, having to maintain the exterior of their property to a standard established by our HDC that, as often is the case, is more expensive than an alternative approach, but there were many more issues associated with the request—all very troubling to this Committee. While we had a

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

more-extensive explanation for each of those issues, at this point, we feel it is sufficient to just list them—not necessarily in order of importance—as follows:

1. As with all owners in any of Lexington’s Historic Districts, compliance with an HDC requirement has always been a responsibility of all owners in that development, from day one;
2. The property was sold by the Town without warranty, “as is”, and with a re-sale cap;
3. This proposal was to benefit only a fraction of those owners of affected by the window-replacement requirement;
4. Notwithstanding that it was only a fraction of that fraction of the owners who expressed a current interest in benefiting from the proposed loan, the CPC proposed to request the full, original, amount to Town Meeting
5. Although the reluctance of some of the unit owners was reported as their concern about there being a lien placed on their property to ensure repayment of the no-interest loan to the Town upon the sale of the unit; we’re told that the Association will, itself, effect the replacement and place its own lien on the unit if not done by the unit owner;
6. The no-interest loan was purported to represent no burden to the Town, but this Committee saw several real burdens to the Town;
7. As the repayment of the loans is only required upon the sale of the unit, such repayment will most likely extend over many, many, years—if not decades, and this Committee saw many financial-accounting problems;
8. There was no means test—whether even of just income or, more properly, income & assets—of the prospective beneficiaries of this public support;
9. It has been said that this assistance is warranted as the beneficiaries are in affordable units, but the request is not being made under the community (affordable) housing category of the CPA—and our Town Counsel has advised that category should require such use of the CPF to ensure or enhance the community-housing stock; not to benefit individual owners;
10. There is no external requirement on when to effect the replacement; only an Association requirement; and
11. During the debate at the 2007 ATM on the funding of the Muzzey Condominium Architectural Study (Article 26(l), \$53,500 from the CPF), the building windows were explicitly mentioned as an issue that would have to be faced and at the end of the debate, the question was explicitly raised as to whether Town Meeting would, subsequently, be faced with a request to fund the corrective measures identified by that Study—and the answer was reasonably taken to be “no”.

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(i) Vynebrooke Village Drainage Improvements (Community Housing)	\$364,800	CPF (Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This project follows upon a design study funded in FY 2011 of the drainage problems at this state-funded public housing development. At present, water accumulates around the units and flows into the crawl spaces below the apartments. Each apartment is equipped with a sump pump, but the pumps are not adequate to handle flow from large storm events, and this situation has worsened over the years. This project to preserve community housing would fund the construction of a drainage system around the perimeter of the units that would tie into the storm drain system; a venting system to prevent inflow into the units; and the installation of a dehumidification system in each unit.” [Brown Book, Page XI-17].

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(j) Busa Farm Debt Service (Potentially Multiple)	\$974,600	\$757,715 CPF (Cash) + \$216,885 GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

The May 6, 2009 Special Town Meeting, under Article 6 (Land Purchase—Off Lowell Street), authorized \$4,197,000 for the purchase of the Busa-farm land. The purchase closed on December 4, 2009, and the initial funding was provided from the Town's available cash (rather than through the use of an interest-only Bond Anticipation Note (BAN)). On February 25, 2010, as part of the Town's issuing of a total of \$10,447,000 in bonds, a 3-year bond was issued to cover the purchase of the land. Payments of the debt service are due, in accordance with the usual practice, semi-annually with the 1st being only part of the interest for the year (in this case, due on each August 15th) and the 2nd being principal & the balance of the interest for the year (in this case, due on each February 15th).

At last-year's ATM, CPF in the amount of \$2,562,100 were appropriated for the first-year's full principal (\$2,425,000) and full interest (\$137,100) payment on that bond. This request is for the second-year's \$886,000 in principal and \$88,600 in interest. Next year a request for \$930,300 (\$886,000 in principal and \$44,300 in interest) will be required to be appropriated and paid in order to retire the bond on schedule on February 15, 2013.

This year's request has \$216,885 coming from the GF (Free Cash)—thereby reducing the burden on the CPF—as that amount represents the CPF's proportional share—net of its share of the bond-issuing cost—of the premium and accrued interest received, and deposited into the GF, when the bond was issued.

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(k) Cotton Farm Debt Service (Open Space)	\$1,300,604	CPF (Cash)	Approval (5–0)

This is the 2nd of 3 payments to the seller for the \$3,800,000 purchase authorized at last year's ATM under its Article 9 of a portion of the 121 Marrett Road property known as the Cotton Farm by the Town to preserve open space. (An additional \$57,000 was included in the total request for the Town's costs associated with the closing on the purchase.)

The 1st payment to the seller, made at closing, was \$1,500,000 from the CPF and the seller agreed to no-interest financing of the balance over two years. The 2nd payment of \$1,300,000, due to the seller in FY2012, was accelerated to FY2011—and, therefore, discounted to \$1,297,400 to offset financing costs to be borne by the Town that were not originally contemplated. On February 16th of this year, a Bond Anticipation Note (BAN) was issued at an interest rate of 0.70% and due on July 1st of this year. This request for the FY2012 increment is to pay off on July 1, 2011, in full, that BAN. (A request to fund the 3rd, and final, payment of \$1,000,000 in FY2013 is a matter for next-year's ATM.)

If, as expected, this 2011 Annual Town Meeting approves Article 33 (see Page 57) and the \$500,000 from that Commonwealth of Massachusetts grant has been received by July 1, 2011, those funds would be used along with just \$800,604 from the CPF for that payoff. (As a grant, that \$500,000 doesn't have to be appropriated so no action is needed by Town Meeting to permit their use.) The then-unused \$500,000 of CPF funds appropriated under this sub-element would become available for appropriation at a subsequent Town Meeting for another, permitted, CPA purpose.

We have asked that, if practical, at least \$500,000 of this appropriation be done so as not to be "tied" to a subsequent Open Space use thereby providing the Community Preservation Committee with the maximum possibility flexibility in the future with the use of those funds.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

<i>Project Description(CPA Category)</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(l) Administrative Budget	\$150,000	CPF (Cash)	Approval (5-0)

Of the request, \$50,000 is for the planning, legal, survey and appraisal work associated with the acquisition of open space. Such funds will enable the Conservation Commission to act in a timely fashion to complete the due diligence required to prepare for a land acquisition. While other Town projects use “study monies” to investigate the benefits of a particular project, the Conservation Commission does not have the advantage of this type of lead-time. It must often act quickly to evaluate a property through legal, survey and appraisal work. Without designating these funds for open space planning, the CPC’s charge of allocating a portion of its revenues to open-space preservation would be hindered.

The remaining \$100,000 funds the administrative, legal, membership, and advertising expenses. Included are \$40,706 for a year-round, 3 days/week (the Town’s GF covers the other 2 days), administrative assistant and \$7,500 for membership in the Community Preservation Coalition—a State-wide, non-profit, organization working on behalf of communities who have adopted the CPA.

[Communication, March 7, 2011, with the Administrative Assistant to the CPC]

If any of these funds appropriated for the Administrative Budget are not required for such administrative expenses by the end of the fiscal year, that balance will become part of the Undesignated Fund Balance. Then, the Undesignated Fund Balance become part of the CPF’s total available for appropriation.

<i>Article 9: Appropriate for Recreation Capital Project—Town Pool Renovations</i>	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$165,000	\$165,000 Recreation EF (RE)	Approval (5-0)

“This request is for phase II of a multi-phased program of renovations to the Irving H. Mabee Pool Complex. Proposed renovations were identified in a consulting study completed in 2008. Phase I, approved at the 2010 annual town meeting, includes the replacement of the hot water system, the ventilation and exhaust system, and compliance and safety issues. The \$165,000 requested for Phase II is for interior repairs, renovations to enhance environmental and energy efficiency at the complex including the replacement of toilets, showers and sinks in the men’s and women’s locker rooms with water conserving systems....”[Brown Book, Page XI-15]

<i>Article 10: Appropriate for Municipal Capital Projects and Equipment</i>	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$3,632,702 (plus \$700,000 Chap. 90 State Aid for a total of \$4,332,702)	\$2,150,000 GF (Debt) + \$290,000 GF (Free Cash) + \$846,602 GF (Cash) + \$120,100 Water EF (Debt) + \$25,000 Water EF (RE) + \$201,000 Traffic Mitigation SF	Approval (5–0)

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(a) Dam Repair—Phase I	\$270,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“The March 2010 flooding events magnified some serious deficiencies of the Butterfield Dam inlet and outlet control structures. There is sufficient concern about these deficiencies to prompt this concurrent request for design and construction funding so that these deficiencies can be addressed in the upcoming construction season. The town has a responsibility to maintain the structural integrity of this dam and to report the conditions to the Massachusetts Department of Dam Safety.” [Brown Book, Page XI-4]

This will fund the design & engineering, permitting, and the extraordinary repairs to the dam’s inlet & outlet culverts. A second phase, currently estimated to also cost \$270,000, will work on the upstream & downstream slopes of the dam.

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(b) DPW Equipment	\$485,100	\$365,000 GF (Debt) + \$120,100 Water EF (RE)	Approval (5–0)

“This is an annual request to replace equipment that is beyond its useful life and whose mechanical condition no longer meets the work requirements. The Department of Public Works has an inventory of 146 pieces of equipment including sedans, hybrid SUVs, construction vehicles and specialized equipment used to mow parks, plow snow, repair streets and complete a variety of other projects. Without regular equipment replacement, the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the DPW's operations would be handicapped due to equipment down time and excessive repair costs. FY12 requests are for a tractor with snow blower & mower, a 6-wheel dump truck with plow, a slice seeder, an aerator, a mower with collection system, a utility cart with attachments, and a street sweeper. The piece of equipment to be funded from water department debt is the 6-wheel dump truck which will support water department operations.” [Brown Book, Page XI-4 & XI-9]

DPW FY2011 Capital Equipment List

Wacker WL-30 Tractor with Snow Blower & Mower (\$62,000) (replaces 1988 New Holland Skid Steer, original cost \$18,300)

6-Wheel Heavy-Duty Dump Truck with Plow & Stainless-Steel Body (\$138,100 [\$18,000 GF (Debt) + \$120,100 Water EF (Debt)]) (replaces 1997 International 10-Wheel Dump Truck used for plowing and by the Water & Sewer Divisions, original cost \$107,392)

Slice Seeder (\$25,000) (replaces 1990 Land Pride Slice Seeder, original cost unknown)

Aerator (\$25,000) (replaces 1985 Ryan Aerator, original cost \$2,850)

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

Mower with Grass/Leaf Collection System (\$60,000) (replaces 2002 John Deere Mower with Grass/Leaf Collection System, original cost \$32,428)

Utility Cart with Dump Body & Hitch for Attachments (\$30,000) (replaces un-numbered, ~2001, battery-operated golf cart, original cost unknown)

Highway Street Sweeper (\$145,000) (replaces 1998 Elgin Pelican Street Sweeper (\$90,476)

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(c) Storm Drainage Improvements	\$500,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“Pre-emptive repair of existing drainage structures will reduce damage to the structures themselves, to existing pavement and to public and private property. Recent history has shown that most roadway related construction activity uncovers drainage structures that are in need of repair. \$450,000 of this request will be used to repair/replace drainage structures encountered during the road resurfacing program as well as repair other drainage areas of concern in town. Specifically, it is estimated that \$290,000 will be for extensive drain work as part of the reconstruction of Shade Street. Another \$160,000 is requested for other drain work throughout town. The remaining \$50,000 is requested for activities that include detecting and eliminating illicit discharge sources, monitoring outfalls and other mandated activities in order to comply with the new Phase II Stormwater regulations.” [Brown Book, Page XI-5]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(d) Sidewalk Improvements and Easements	\$200,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“This is an annual request to rebuild and/or repave existing asphalt sidewalks that are deteriorated and to construct new sidewalks with bituminous and granite or asphalt curbing. Sidewalk improvements will support and enhance pedestrian safety and the Safe Routes to School Program. Sidewalk projects will be chosen from the Sidewalk Committee’s master plan and all work will be ADA compliant.” [Brown Book, Page XI-5]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(e) Replacement of Ambulance	\$240,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“The Lexington Fire Department has 3 ambulances in its fleet. The two newest vehicles are the primary responders. The third vehicle (the oldest vehicle) serves as a backup for the two primary vehicles in the event one goes down for repairs. This proposal will replace the oldest of the three which is a 2002 model, and will have over 120,000 miles at the time of replacement. One of the two primaries will be relegated to serve as the backup vehicle.” [Brown Book, Page XI-5]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(f) MIS Technology Improvement Program	\$165,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“Last year, when submitting the request for Town Hall Server Room Improvements, MIS identified needs for future year's technology improvements. This request is for the first of two phases to implement those previously described improvements. The FY12 project will pursue technical consolidation and energy savings with the purchase and installation of SAN and blade server technology. This will allow for the

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

migration of the stand alone server technology to an energy and space efficient server infrastructure. Additionally, the introduction of blade servers reduces demands on systems support personnel through centralization, and reduces replacement server costs in the operating budget as blade servers are approximately half the cost of standalone servers....” [Brown Book, Page XI-5]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(g) Townwide Electronic Document Management System	\$410,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“This request is being submitted on behalf of municipal and school departments. The Laserfiche document management system was purchased approximately 3 years ago and implemented as a municipal records repository. Municipal departments, now in a joint effort with the School Department, seek to expand both the capability and capacity of Laserfiche to include additional documents and expand archive storage. The request includes upgrading to the Enterprise version of Laserfiche, the purchase of additional modules to add functionality to the system, replacement of the server, and scanning of documents to populate the school database.” [Brown Book, Page XI-6]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(h) Hydrant Replacement Project	\$50,000	\$25,000 GF (Cash) + \$25,000 Water EF (RE)	Approval (5–0)

“There are 1,500 hydrants in Lexington’s fire protection system. This is the fifth request in a phased project to replace older fire hydrants with new and more efficient hydrants that meet NFPA requirements. The new hydrants will increase fire fighting capacity thus reducing property damage and increasing safety. The new hydrant will be of a break-away design which will cost less to replace when damaged. \$50,000 will fund approximately 25 replacements.” [Brown Book, Page XI-13]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(i) South Lexington Transportation Master Plan	\$125,000	Traffic Mitigation SF	Approval (5–0)

“The Transportation Master Plan for South Lexington will provide long-term guidance on safety improvements and strategies for the area and improve alternative modes of transportation. This plan was part of the traffic mitigation agreements for Patriot Partners, Cubist and Ledgemont CD rezoning.” [Brown Book, Page XI-14]

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(j) Street Improvements and Easements	\$846,602 (plus \$700,000 Chapter 90 State Aid for a total of \$1,546,602)	\$500,000 GF (Cash, FY2001 Override Set- aside) + \$65,368 GF (Cash) + \$281,234 GF (cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This request for the annual street resurfacing program is comprised of \$846,602 of tax levy dollars of which \$565,36[8] derives from a 2001 operating budget override, and an anticipated distribution of \$700,000 of Chapter 90 funds. Over and above the \$565,36[8] in tax levy dollars from the 2001 override, an additional \$281,234 of tax levy support has been recommended for FY12, the source of which is from the allocation of incremental revenue to municipal operations from the FY12 Revenue Allocation Model. This funding will allow for the proper maintenance and repair of Lexington's streets and sidewalks, increasing their quality and safety. Specifically, funds will be used for design, inspections, planning, repair and resurfacing.” [Brown Book, Page XI-14]

The state of this Town's roadway infrastructure has been a major concern of this Committee for a long time and acknowledging that among the large number of un-prioritized “big ticket” projects provides us little solace. The FST Pavement Management Study, completed in November 2010, provides a current, quantitative, appraisal to substantiate how serious is the problem and, with regard to this request for funding, affirms that this band-aid approach—while better than doing nothing—isn't sufficient. (See more information on that study beginning on Page 21.) We commend the Board of Selectmen for adding the \$281,234 supplement to what, otherwise, would have been just the \$565,368 in tax-levy funding based on the 2001 override to supplement the Chapter 90 funding; however, the total amount requested falls far short—by at least an order of magnitude—of the amount required to properly address the roadway-infrastructure problem. (We also note that the supplement came from the Municipal-only share of the available revenue, rather than—as we feel is properly done with the rest of the cash-capital program—from the shared-expense allocation of the available revenue.)

We join others in reaffirming the need to schedule a debt-exclusion request to the voters to address the funding needed to bring that infrastructure up to an acceptable condition which, then, could reasonably be expect to be maintained with the level of funding routinely provided by requests such as the one before this Town Meeting.

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(k) Westview Cemetery Irrigation – Phase III	\$35,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This request is for funds to complete the in-ground irrigation system for the Westview Cemetery. There are two sections remaining that need in-ground irrigation to help improve and maintain turf appearance, its vigor and recovery. Water is essential for turf to grow and is especially important for seed establishment. Lack of proper irrigation will lead to deteriorating turf which will result in higher maintenance costs and unsightly appearance of the grave sites.” [Brown Book, Page XI-14]

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(l) Comprehensive Watershed Stormwater Management	\$50,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This request is for consultant services for initial design development of improvements recommended in phase one of a three phase study. DPW, Engineering and Conservation are collaborating on addressing drainage/brook management issues. They have identified problems including sediment buildup in brooks and wetlands and culvert deterioration and blockages which reduce the volume of water that can be handled by our drainage system. If this issue is not addressed in the very near future, the risk of flooding due to poor drainage will increase and cause private property damage and Town infrastructure damage. Upon completion of the three phases, the 18 brooks within the 3 watersheds in Lexington (Charles River, Mystic River, and Shawsheen River) will have been studied...” [Brown Book, Page XI-14]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(m) Townwide Signalization Improvement	\$42,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This project is part of an annual program to upgrade signalized intersections throughout town. Engineering staff is in the process of a Traffic Intersection Signal Study funded with Traffic Mitigation funds that includes pedestrian signals. The signal compliance study includes ADA compliance, condition assessment, signal timing, delays, priority of need, and energy efficiency. The FY12 request is to update pedestrian signals at the Bedford/Hill/Revere intersection.” [Brown Book, Page XI-14]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(n) Waltham Street Pedestrian Safety Improvements	\$66,000	Traffic Mitigation SF	Approval (5–0)

“This request would allow for the installation of a high visibility pedestrian crossing on Waltham Street in the vicinity of Brookhaven. A study of the area has been completed and the Traffic Safety Advisory Committee has recommended the installation to provide a clear indication to vehicles that there is a pedestrian crossing and to make the street safer for pedestrians. Waltham Street is very heavily travelled and has numerous destination points such as stores and banks on both sides of the street. Additionally, there is a dense population of elderly residents in the Brookhaven neighborhood who cross in this area for shopping.” [Brown Book, Page XI-15]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(o) Park Improvements – Athletic Fields	\$50,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“The request for this annual program will target the Franklin ball field area. Lexington’s athletic fields see excessive use by recreation, school, youth, and adult groups and the Franklin ballfield area has not been renovated in over 20 years. The proposed renovations will include infield and outfield grading and turf replacement to improve drainage and increase playability, installation of irrigation where appropriate, and replacement of backstop and player benches to correct safety issues.” [Brown Book, Page XI-15]

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(p) Firefighter Protection Turnout Gear	\$88,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5-0)

“Turnout gear is the primary safety garment worn by firefighters to provide protection against burns, exhaustion, and exposure to toxic fumes. Since the Lexington Fire Department upgraded all of its protective gear in 1997, on a continuous basis the gear has been replaced through the operating budget. This year several sets of gear were returned as not certifiable, and a subsequent audit of all gear indicates 40 sets of deficient gear. Deficiencies include compromised vapor barriers, damaged internal thermal barriers, and ultraviolet-damaged outer shells. This capital request will allow the funding available through the operating budget to properly maintain the condition of turnout gear going forward.” [Brown Book, Page XI-16]

The 40 replacement units (suits) purchased under this Article represent about half the number used by the Department. Future purchases, which will be in lesser quantities, will be made using operating funds.

<i>Article 11: Appropriate for Sewer System Improvements</i>	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$1,300,000	Wastewater EF (Debt)	Approval (5-0)

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(a) Sanitary Sewer System Improvements	\$1,200,000	\$900,000 Wastewater EF (Debt) + \$300,000 Wastewater EF (RE)	Approval (5-0)

“This is an annual request for rehabilitation of sanitary sewer infrastructure. Engineering investigation and evaluation will be done on sewers in remote, inaccessible areas, such as along brook channels where poor soil conditions lead to storm water infiltration. Work will include replacement or repair of deteriorated sewers and manholes in easements. Sewage leaks and overflows present a direct danger to the health of the community through transmission of waterborne diseases. In addition, the Town’s assessment by the MWRA for sewage treatment is based on total flow through the meter at the Arlington town line, so excessive flow of stormwater in the sewer results in unnecessarily higher sewage bills. Projects may be eligible for MWRA grant loan program funding if additional funding is made available. Requested funds will be for improvements to the Saddle Club Road and Parker Street areas and adjacent ‘sewer sheds’.” [Brown Book, Page XI-9]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(b) Pump Station Upgrades	\$100,000	Wastewater EF (Debt)	Approval (5-0)

“Lexington has ten sewer pumping stations valued at over \$6 million. This request is...for upgrades of the stations including bringing them in compliance with federal (OSHA) regulations, and equipment replacement. The pump stations are evaluated every year to ensure they are operating within design parameters. As the system ages, motors and valves need to be replaced and entryways need to be brought up to current OSHA Standards. Pump failure results in sewer surcharging and overflows, which create a public health risk and environmental damage.” [Brown Book, Page XI-9]

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

FY2012 was originally contemplated to be the last in a 5-year program, but the program has been extended for four more years (to FY2016) to fulfill the needs of all 10 wastewater-pumping stations. Four stations have already been addressed and two more, smaller, stations will be addressed with this funding.

Article 12: Appropriate for School Capital Projects and Equipment	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$921,000 (plus \$30,000 Food Service RF)	\$686,000 GF (Debt) + \$235,000 GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

Project Description	Amount Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
(a) School Technology	\$737,000	\$502,000 GF (Debt) + \$235,000 GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This request supports the Lexington Public School’s Strategic Goal of enhancing the capacity to utilize technology as an instructional and administrative tool. Funding is requested for:

- replacement of the oldest desktop and laptop computers;
- increasing the number of student workstations at the High School and the two middle schools to get closer to the state average number of computers available for student use;
- replacement of printers and peripherals;
- maintaining and updating the head end equipment for local area networks and servers in the elementary schools;
- installing a managed wireless network that can control up to 50 access points in both the Diamond and Clarke Middle Schools; and
- providing additional classroom computer projectors and document readers.

“More than half of the requested funds will be used to replace computers that will be 6 years old. Our oldest computers cannot run current versions of instructional software and have difficulty acquiring needed networking resources. The middle school wireless networks represent Phase 2 of a 3-phase project; the high school was Phase 1 and the five elementary schools that are not wireless will be Phase 3. Document readers were introduced into the school system last year, and teachers have found them to be extremely important at all grade levels to carry out class instructional activities.”

[Brown Book, Page XI-7 & -11]

Project Description	Amount Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
(b) Food Service Equipment	\$34,000 (plus \$30,000 Food Service RF for a total of \$64,000)	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“This request is for the replacement of four of six ovens, one steamer, and one mixer in the Lexington High School kitchen. The quantity of food served from the High School has grown steadily over the last few years resulting in the need to replace the current ovens and purchase two additional ovens to address safety concerns and implement efficient cooking strategies to meet demand. Four of the six ovens have open pilots and occasionally the pilots have gone out creating a dangerous natural gas situation in the kitchen area. Last year, the gas company declared one roasting oven unserviceable and resulted in the

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

oven being shut off. The Public Facilities Department agrees replacement is justified as the ovens have required regular repair over the last few years. The Food Service Program has already replaced two of the six ovens this past January out of program funds due to failure and inoperability of the remaining four.

“In January, the steamer at the High School failed resulting in menu modifications until a replacement is purchased. The current industrial grade mixer has exceeded its useful life due to its daily use to shred 75 pounds a week of government cheese delivered in large blocks. Of particular concern is the lack of a safety guard. Due to the age of the machine, no safety guard is available.

“It is the obligation of the school district to provide working commercial kitchens to our food service program. This is the first year in which the School Lunch Revolving Fund has been able to financially support the replacement of equipment of such significance. In addition to this request, the program has supported \$20,000 in emergency repairs or replacements of kitchen equipment this current school year. In the past, these types of repairs and replacements would have been a transfer request to the School Committee or a larger capital request to Town Meeting.”

[Brown Book, Page XI-7]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(c) Classroom Furniture	\$150,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“Many buildings have not been renovated and need to have classroom furnishings replaced. The schools need cafeteria tables, desks, age appropriate chairs, and teacher desks and chairs, filing cabinets, whiteboards, swing and fitness center equipment as well as funds to dispose of the old furniture... This is an annual request for replacement of furniture that has reached the end of its useful life [Brown Book, Page XI-8]

<i>Article 13: Appropriate for Public Facilities Capital Projects</i>	<i>Funds Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
	\$4,075,250 (plus \$338,322 MSRB for a total of \$4,513,572)	\$3,064,678 GF (Debt) (includes \$1,430,000 candidate for exclusion) + \$845,000 GF (Free Cash) + \$165,572 GF (Cash)	(See Below)

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(a) Bridge and Bowman Schools Renovation Design, Development and Engineering (Additional)	\$280,000	GF (Debt) Candidate for Debt Exclusion	Approval (5–0)

“The schematic design phase of the Bridge and Bowman Renovation Project yielded options to further enhance the useful life of the two schools. This request is for additional design funds to add interior architectural modifications that will result in security enhancements, small meeting spaces, and four additional classrooms in each school. Additional enhancements to building systems will result in educational spaces with improved learning environments, improved lighting, quieter ventilation, and humidity reduction. These improvements support program and educational needs of the two elementary

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

schools with the largest student population. This increased scope increases estimated project cost to \$19.4 million from an earlier estimate of \$13.7 million.” [Brown Book, Page XI-8]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(b) Estabrook School Feasibility and Related Street-Access Improvements	\$1,150,000	GF (Debt) Candidate for Debt Exclusion	Approval (5–0)

“An Emergency Statement of Interest (SOI) has been submitted to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) to determine if the replacement of the Estabrook School qualifies for support from MSBA. Due to the recent discovery of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB’s) at the Estabrook School, the replacement of the school has been prioritized. This request will fund the Feasibility Study phase of the MSBA process (\$1,050,000) should the MSBA participate in the project. In addition to the Feasibility Study, this capital request seeks funds (\$200,000) for right-of-way modifications and upgrading of Robinson Road to current code. As identified in the LPS PreK - 12 Master Plan, a second access is recommended to the Estabrook School should the building be replaced.” [Brown Book, Page XI-8]

The funding for the design & engineering to upgrade Robinson Road as a second access has been reduced from the earlier-contemplated \$200,000 (as cited in the Brown Book) to \$100,000.

We expect that this request will be presented to Town Meeting in two Motions as the MSBA requires that any request to fund such a Feasibility Study phase must be approved in a stand-alone vote by, in the case of Lexington, its Town Meeting.

The funding for the construction of the school—currently estimated at \$28,950,000 (which is a correction to the amount shown in the Brown Book’s out-year capital requests on Page XI-18)—and for the upgrade of Robinson Road—currently estimated at up to \$1,000,000—would be requested at a subsequent Town Meeting.

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(c) School Building Envelope and Systems	\$300,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

“This project involves performing annual prioritized design, repairs and modifications to prevent deterioration of school building exteriors and building systems. Proper maintenance of school buildings requires continual investment in the building envelope and building systems. This includes repair of damaged panels and siding, re-caulking and weatherproofing windows and doors, and repainting the wood exterior. Small, individual items such as failure of a specific door or window or small painting projects will continue to be funded through the operating budget. FY 2012 priorities may include replacing LHS fascia, main entrance doorways, and Science Building entrance. Funding will also be used for ad hoc modifications to school educational spaces district-wide to accommodate enrollment changes.” [Brown Book, Page XI-11]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(d) School Improvement Projects	\$645,000	\$325,000 GF (Debt) + \$320,000 GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5–0)

(i) School Locker Program (\$150,000, GF (Debt)): “Student and athletic lockers provide a safe and secure means for students to protect their personal belongings while in school. Due to constant use they are subject to wear and tear. This project will replace student lockers at Clarke Middle School that cannot be repaired because replacement parts are no longer available. These

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

lockers are the original lockers from the last school construction project. Once replaced, they will be maintained though the Public Facilities annual operating budget.” [Brown Book, Page XI-6]

(ii) Lexington High School (LHS) Overcrowding—Phase I (\$175,000, GF (Debt)): “This project is the first in a series of small construction projects to improve space utilization at LHS and reduce overcrowding, where feasible. The preK - 12 Master Plan identified overcrowding at LHS as an issue that affects student and faculty programs. The plan suggested co-locating the Arts staff on the second floor of the main building to be near the Arts programs. The space adjacent to the Black Box Theater is currently underutilized and can be modified to include offices for the Department Heads and administrator. The move will also create space so the Deans’ office suite can better respond to student needs.” [Brown Book, Page XI-6]

(iii) School Building Flooring Program (\$50,000, GF (Free Cash)): “This project will replace carpet, vinyl tile, and ceramic tile flooring systems that have failed or are beyond their useful life and exceed \$25,000 in cost. Flooring systems must be replaced periodically to insure the surfaces are safe and cleanable. Worn or broken flooring creates a tripping hazard, can provide harborage for bacteria and water, and is difficult to clean. Smaller repairs of flooring components are funded through the operating budget.” [Brown Book, Page XI-12]

(iv) Lexington High School Science Lecture Hall Replacement Seating (\$75,000, GF (Free Cash)): “The LHS Science Lecture Hall seats 290 and is a highly utilized space for the school and the community. This project will replace the wooden, floor mounted seats with riser mounted plastic seats. The wooden seats in the lecture hall are in poor condition, with graffiti and many broken components. The proposed plastic seats are more easily maintained, less prone to graffiti, and will be mounted on the risers instead of the floor to make sweeping more efficient.” [Brown Book, Page XI-12]

(v) Hastings School French Drain (\$50,000, GF (Free Cash)): “During the summer of 2010, Public Facilities implemented exterior improvements to the east elevation of Hastings School to reduce and eliminate water infiltration. The situation has improved, but during heavy rains water is still seeping in at the slab/wall seam. The project will install a french drain along the east perimeter wall to contain and channel ground water to a location where it can be pumped out of the building.” [Brown Book, Page XI-12]

(vi) Diamond School Gym and Locker Room Public Address System Improvements (\$25,000, GF (Free Cash)): “The speaker system that serves the Diamond School gym, exercise room and locker rooms will be upgraded. The system was installed around 1956 and does not project sound well. Students and staff often do not hear announcements. Emergency calls and essential communications are of critical importance. In addition, many athletic events and school gatherings are held in the gym and clear sound is desirable.” [Brown Book, Page XI-13]

(vii) Hastings School Window Screens (\$25,000, GF (Free Cash)): “This request is to purchase window screens for classrooms and library windows at Hastings School. The temperatures in these classrooms can be above 94 degrees in the spring and fall, so classrooms windows are opened. Screens are needed as a barrier to insects that could cause health and safety problems for students and staff.” [Brown Book, Page XI-13]

(viii) Systemwide School Window Treatment (\$50,000, GF (Free Cash)): “The majority of Lexington’s school buildings have inoperable horizontal blinds that were installed when the buildings were constructed. This project will replace these window treatments with low maintenance solar shades to increase energy efficiency, control sun glare, and improve overall lighting control in the educational space.” [Brown Book, Page XI-13]

(ix) Reconfigure and Redesign K-5 Curriculum Rooms (\$45,000, GF (Free Cash)): “This project will reconfigure rooms at the Central Office that are used by K-5 curriculum coordinators, program leaders and department heads. Funds are needed to purchase and install shelving and office furniture, install air conditioners and telephones, and move materials so that resources are located and organized appropriately for ease of use and accessibility. These changes will allow

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

the Math, Literacy, Science, and Social Studies program staff to make efficiencies in their individual programming needs.” [Brown Book, Page XI-13]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(e) Clarke Middle School Paving Improvements	\$125,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“This project consists of two projects to improve pedestrian safety. A sidewalk will be installed from the Clarke pedestrian bridge over Clematis Brook to Brookside Avenue to provide a safe walkway for students and an alternative from cutting across the parking lot. In addition, the parking lot by the tennis courts will be relocated to increase the turning radius for buses. During student drop off and pick up times, the school buses and parent vehicles can become congested navigating the parking lot from Brookside to the school as the turning radius is not sufficient for buses to stay inside the traffic lane. This plan was determined to be the best of the options considered, and has been reviewed by the Sidewalk Committee, Conservation Commission, Public Facilities, DPW, the bus company, and the Clarke administration.” [Brown Book, Page XI-6]

This Committee understands, and supports, that the estimated \$23,000 D&E for this effort using funding already appropriated for DPF’s use on outside contracting so as to make it practical to be ready to accomplish this work at the Clarke Middle School during the 2011 summer construction period under the funds being requested in this sub-element. We also acknowledge that the relatively high ratio of D/E-to-construction funding is reasonable as there is the need to prepare for the permitting required with the Conservation Commission.

This Committee has been requested to work with the DPF and the Assistant Town Manager for Finance in developing a specific set of alternatives by which to fund D&E early enough so that projects can be ready for execution in the next, practical, construction period—with special consideration of the need for most school projects to be accomplished outside of the normal school year. We welcome that request and offer our full support to developing such alternatives for presentation to a subsequent Town Meeting.

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(f) Lexington High School Roof Repair	\$659,678 (plus \$338,322 MSBA for a total of \$998,000)	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“The request is to replace approximately 66,000 square feet of roofing at Lexington High School. This replacement is being completed with support from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) under the Green Repair Program. The MSBA has committed to funding 33.9% of the total cost of this project, with Lexington funding the remaining balance, which is estimated to be approximately \$660,000. [Brown Book, Page XI-6]

As the MSBA has committed to a portion of the cost, we are told it is not necessary to request an appropriation for the full cost.

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(g) Hastings School Playground Expansion	\$75,000	GF (Debt)	Approval (5–0)

“This request is to expand the Hastings School playground to include playground equipment suitable for grades 3-5. The existing playground does not accommodate differences in the older students’ physical size and ability, cognitive and social skills, or curriculum needs.” [Brown Book, Page XI-6]

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(h) School Paving Program	\$50,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5-0)

“This project requests funds to maintain school parking and paved pedestrian surfaces in a condition suitable for public use. In the last four years paving improvements have been implemented at Estabrook, Bridge, Bowman and Hastings. The Department of Public Facilities and the Department of Public Works Engineering partner on these projects to utilize the DPW paving bids.” [Brown Book, Page XI-12]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(i) Diamond Middle School [Modular] Extraordinary Repair	\$75,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval (5-0)

“The portable classrooms are worn and battered, both inside and out, after more than 10 years of use. The exterior sheathing is buckling and delaminating. The interiors show signs of age in doors that do not lock properly, buckling flooring in bathrooms, and loose hallway trim and molding. As every available classroom space is currently scheduled at Diamond, the portables need to be maintained as viable classrooms.” [Brown Book, Page XI-12]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(j) Municipal Building Envelope and Systems	\$165,572	\$165,572 GF (Cash)	Approval (5-0)

“This ongoing capital request includes design and construction repair/replacement projects for the maintenance and upgrade of municipal buildings and systems. Repairs to roofs, windows, mechanical and electrical systems, and interior finishes are required on a continual basis to maintain town facilities for their intended function. The public building infrastructure will always need to be maintained, repaired, and upgraded to prevent structural deterioration and avoid safety hazards. The projects within this program do not increase the size of the public building stock and therefore do not result in increased utility usage or maintenance costs.” [Brown Book, Page XI-12]

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(k) Repair of Fire Station Floor	\$450,000	GF (Debt)	Approval as conditioned below (5-0)

“This request is to implement a temporary repair of the Fire Headquarters floor slab. An engineering analysis identified that the failing apparatus room floor slab requires extensive shoring to extend its useful life.” [Brown Book, Page XI-7]

While this Committee supports the appropriation, as there is an on-going study to confirm the concept of the shoring system and to refine its cost, we ask that we be included in the vetting of that study's results before any of these funds are used to further design or implement that system.

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(l) Library Material Handling System Design	\$100,000	GF (Free Cash)	Approval as conditioned below (5-0)

“At the 2010 annual town meeting, \$25,000 was appropriated for an engineering study of how to reorganize the Library’s Circulation and Bibliographic Services workspace with the potential for automating bin sorting and processing. The current configuration is not designed to handle the volume of

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

material that flows through the library daily. Library circulation increased 14% in FY09, from 668,313 to 762,718. In FY10 it increased an additional 5%. Increased circulation creates an overflow of items that are returned through the exterior book drops and via Network Transfer Bins. Each day, 15-25 bins are delivered to the Circulation Department work area via a public elevator. Reorganization would improve the ergonomic and efficient handling of materials so that library users have faster access to items. There are also health and safety concerns for the employees who work in a location that is not ergonomically designed for warehouse-type work.

“Though the engineering study has yet to be completed, design funds are being requested for funding at the 2011 annual town meeting. Postponement of this request until completion of the engineering study, which is anticipated late spring, would result in the loss of one year in moving this project forward. With design funding in hand, a firm estimate of construction/installation costs can be obtained and will be submitted for funding at the 2012 annual town meeting.”

[Brown Book, Page XI-13]

While this Committee supports the appropriation, as there is an on-going engineering study to recommend one or more solutions to the problem and to define their costs, we ask that we be included in the vetting of that study's results before any of these funds are used to further design or implement such solutions.

Article 14: Street Acceptance— Frances Road (Citizen Article)	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$200,000	Assessment of Betterments	Approval (4–1)

“The Department of Public Works has received one petition from residents of Frances Road for street improvements to bring it up to Town standards. The estimated cost of the improvement, which includes the repair of the roadway and the installation of proper drainage, is \$200,000. Given that these improvements will directly benefit the abutters, it is proposed that they be assessed a betterment charge to cover the cost to bring the street up to Town standards. Upon completion of repairs, the road will become part of the town network for maintenance.” [Brown Book, Page XI-5]

The minority position is that the Town should not increase its long-term financial obligations by increasing, when it need not do so, the roadway infrastructure for which the Town then becomes responsible.

Article 15: Appropriate for Community Center (Citizen Article)	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	Unknown	Unknown	Indefinite Postponement (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate a sum of money for constructing a new Community Center to serve seniors and other members of the community on the White House lot....” [Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 13]

This Committee has been told the Motion will be to Indefinitely Postpone this Article.

Article 17: Reduce Community Preservation Act (CPA) Surcharge (Citizen Article)	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	Disapproval (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to amend its acceptance of Sections 3 to 7, inclusive, of Chapter 44B of the General Laws, otherwise known as the Massachusetts Community Preservation Act (the “Act”) to reduce the surcharge from 3% of the annual real estate tax levy against real property to 1% of the annual real estate tax levy against real property, such reduced surcharge to be applied to assessment of fiscal year 2012 taxes and thereafter, and said amendment to become effective only upon the affirmative vote of a majority of the voters of Lexington....” [Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 14]

Background

In a March 2006 referendum vote, Lexington ratified the Community Preservation Act (CPA) at the maximum tax surcharge of 3%. The CPA requires that once ratified, it must remain in effect for 5 years before any attempt to repeal it may be made. Although the CPA allows for changing the surcharge at any time (including during the 5 years following adoption), this is the first time a change to the CPA has come before Town Meeting in Lexington. Prior to the ratification vote, this Committee recommended (unanimously) that Town Meeting reject the CPA in Lexington, primarily citing concerns about "crowding" future Proposition 2½ override votes. See below for more on this topic.

Timing

A change to the surcharge requires: (1) a majority vote by Town Meeting, and (2) a majority approval in a town-wide referendum. The CPA requires that any referendum to modify the surcharge or rescind the CPA must be at a regular town election. Since there is no *regular* November 2011 election, the earliest possible date for such a referendum is March 2012. Further, since the FY2012 tax rate will be set in December 2011 by the Board of Selectmen, any ratified change to the surcharge cannot take effect until FY2013. Therefore, Article 17 cannot have impact on the FY2012 CPA surcharge revenue projection presented to the current Town Meeting.

Outstanding CPA Debt Service

If Article 17 is approved, and the surcharge is reduced from 3% to 1%, then by statute the surcharge would still need to remain high enough to pay any outstanding debt service that is in excess of the 1% surcharge revenue. Two previous appropriations are funded using debt and therefore carry debt service: Busa Farm (Article 6, 2009 STM), and Cotton Farm (Article 9, 2010 ATM). These debt instruments (on the prior advice of this Committee) are relatively short-term (3 years each), so pragmatically, these two debt service amounts will not have a long-term impact on any surcharge reduction.

State Match

The most important aspect of the CPA is the State "match". Since ratification, Lexington has received \$6,403,189 in matching funds and anticipates an additional about \$859,000 in FY2012. Lexington's actual CPA surcharge revenues (FY2007–FY2010) total \$11,308,509—yielding an effective State-match rate of about 57% over that period. With an additional \$3,181,549 expected in FY2011, that raises the total to \$14,490,058—and with the additional State match expected in FY2012, raising its total since CPA adoption to \$7,262,189, the effective match rate is about 50% over the past 5 years. While the trend in matching percentage has been downward since the 100% the first year Lexington has participated in the CPA to 28% in FY2011 (and with the Massachusetts DOR currently estimating a 1st Round percentage of 25%—which would suggest a final match for Lexington of about 26%), we do not feel it is responsible to try to predict future matching rates as there are several variables presently in play. (See the expanded information in our discussion of the CPA on Page 11.) Up, down, or level are all reasonable possibilities.

Proposition 2½ Debt Exclusions

The CPA has allowed Lexington to appropriate capital monies for many projects, a few of which would generally have required Proposition 2½ Debt Exclusions (D/E) in order to pass. While D/Es are not

strictly necessary for all "big-ticket" projects (they can theoretically be funded in the tax levy), it has been a policy in Lexington to fund them using D/Es. The CPA has, therefore, allowed the Town to move forward more nimbly on several large capital projects without the need for a referendum vote; this streamlining can be viewed as a positive or a negative. Those who view it as a positive would argue that when voters passed the CPA in March 2006, they approved of a D/E-free environment for CPA-eligible projects, at least for the next five years. Those who view it as a negative believe that voters should have a referendum for all "big-ticket" items. There are obviously merits to both facets of this point.

The various land tracts purchased under CPA probably would have been advanced using D/E (if we did not have CPA). We note that use of CPA funds most likely saved the taxpayers money when compared to the same appropriation under a D/E. While it is speculative to presume any bonding term for excluded debt on land, it is probably safe to say that had the Town to purchased land using tax-levy (excluded or not) debt, it would be for a term of at least 10 years, and more likely 20 years. Because of the hesitancy of the Finance Committees and Town Meeting to using any kind of CPA-funded debt, the Busa Farm property was funded using a very aggressive short-term bond; Cotton Farm was funded on a no-net-interest approach, and the Leary property using cash (no interest). Therefore, through the policy decision to use cash and/or aggressive bonding (in addition to the matching funds), CPA saved the taxpayers money.

Project Diversity

The CPA has allowed Lexington to advance several projects that would normally not be considered. For example, the Lexington Historical Society has received funds for restoring the Hancock-Clarke House and Munroe Tavern. Much funding has been approved for community (affordable) housing, which might not have been otherwise. The CPA has allowed the Town to purchase those three major land tracts (Leary, Busa Farm, & Cotton Farm). It seems likely that without the CPA, many of these projects would never be considered for tax-levy funding—which can be viewed as good or bad.

Financial Reserves Building

By statute, the CPA requires minimum 10%-of-the-surcharge allocations each year into three "buckets": reserves for Open Space, Historic Resources, and Community Housing. These reserves (just over \$400,000 per year)—which can be spent, in whole or in part, in any year or held for use in a subsequent year—can be viewed as a positive ("forced" savings for possible currently-unknown projects) or a negative (taxpayer monies should not be held by the Town in reserve without designated uses).

Capital Expenditures Committee (CEC) Perception and Commentary

Having provided advice to Town Meeting regarding all CPA projects for the past 5 years, we offer the following commentary on Article 17.

Challenging Process

It is fair to say that for a variety of reasons, the CPA has been a challenging process to manage.

- It is a fixed 3% surcharge which, unlike tax-levy capital spending, does not vary based on actual project need or taxpayer demand (except that it can be changed by voter referendum).
- The funds can be used for certain types of capital projects, but not all of them are exactly the same projects for which normal capital monies could be used. There is a virtual Venn diagram of projects: those that can only be funded by the taxpayer with the CPA (e.g., those that involve non-Town-owned properties), those that can only be funded with tax-levy, and those that can be funded with either. Pragmatically, the funds can be (and have been) used for projects that would not normally be funded using normal tax-levy capital monies.
- CPA funding is a two-phase appropriation process where the Community Preservation Committee (CPC), a committee of nine members appointed by several diverse bodies act as gatekeepers for the projects—and thus, potential use of the monies—with Town Meeting being the appropriating body. Generally in government, it is clear to whom most boards, commissions, and committees "answer". For example, the Board of Selectmen, School Committee, and Town Meeting Members

answer to the voters. The Capital Expenditures Committee and Appropriation Committee answer to Town Meeting. But the individual CPC members each answer to their respective appointing bodies (three CPC members to the Board of Selectmen; one CPC member to each of the following: Conservation Commission, Planning Board, Recreation Committee, Historical Commission, Housing Authority, and Housing Partnership). (See the Code of Lexington quoted on Page 13.) Each of the CPC members appointed by those interest groups must respect the interests of the other stakeholders at the CPC table, and for the most part they have successfully answered that call and advanced projects which the majority of Town Meeting Members view as worthy. At times, walking this path has been a trying process, but for the most part, the CPC, the Finance Committees, the Board of Selectmen, and the Town staff have worked well together over the past five years.

Planning

Inherent in the charter of the CEC is the requirement that we comment and advise on the five-year capital plan, which of course includes CPA-related projects. It is difficult to write a long-range plan for CPA projects for a couple of reasons. First, land purchases are opportunistic and can arrive "at the table" any time. Second, non-municipal projects also tend to arrive at somewhat random times.

Impact of a Reduction

If Article 17 and subsequent referendum prevail, CPA-related projects would look quite different in Lexington. A cursory scan of the projects that have been funded over the last five years indicates that most of those would not have been funded if only 1%-surcharge revenues had been available (versus the current 3%-surcharge revenues), if only for the simple reason that many of them are larger than we could reasonably afford with only a 1% surcharge. It seems likely that a 1% surcharge environment would not allow for major land purchases like Leary, Busa, and Cotton.

Crowding

Prior to Lexington adopting the CPA in 2006, this Committee had been concerned that once the taxpayers were experiencing the additional demand of the CPA surcharge, that would "crowd out" their support of Proposition 2½ operating overrides and debt exclusions. With 20:20 hindsight, we will be the first to admit that *we were wrong*. So far, that crowding effect has not materialized. In fact, while there was split support for the four overrides in June 2006 (with \$3.2 million of overrides for the schools failing, but \$1.9 million of overrides passing for maintenance and municipal efforts)—which was after the CPA referendum, but before any CPA surcharge; in Jun 2007, after there was a CPA surcharge, there was support for both a \$4.0 million override for the schools and a \$25.2 million debt exclusion for the public works facility (now our public services facility). (See the Brown Book, Page B-9)

That has shown this Committee that the current level of the CPA surcharge did not diminish the support by the Lexington voters for important overrides and debt exclusions. Further, it is reasonably argued that the CPA funding at the current percentage has reduced the number of overrides and debt exclusions to date—and would continue to do so.

Project Costs and Matching Funds

Because of the State-matching funds, the taxpayer funds only 78 cents on the dollar of every CPA project. This is based on last year's 28% reimbursement rate (it is 67 cents on the dollar based on the overall 5-year reimbursement rate of about 50%). But when the matching funds are considered, one must also take into account the projects themselves. Undeniably, there are some projects that have been advanced by the CPC over the past five years that can be considered "controversial". CPA "purists" would argue that only pure preservation projects should be funded using CPA Historical-Resources dollars, although that is not how the statute that was enacted reads. This is in opposition to the Finance Committees' resolute stance that *any capital project that can legally be funded with CPA dollars should be funded with CPA dollars since that is the most efficient for the taxpayer*. Others would argue that big-ticket appropriations (e.g., land purchases) should not be CPA-funded because they are so large that they should be subject to referendum.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

But the fact stands that Lexington has received \$6.4 million of CPA matching funds over the past four years—and expects that to grow to almost \$7.3 million with this year’s match. Whether that money was well used or not is a subjective, and political, question. To answer it, Town Meeting Members must answer the question of whether we received 78 cents worth of value for every dollar spent or 67 cents worth of value, depending on whether you want to look at the most recent reimbursement rate or the historical average reimbursement rate.

Capital Advocacy

It is not this Committee's job to evaluate the political and subjective issues brought forth in this treatise, but we consider it important to have fully discussed the issues and to present them to you.

It is this Committee's job to advise Town Meeting on matters related to what we see as being in the best interest of this Town with regard to capital spending in Lexington. To that end, this Committee recommends disapproval of this article.

<i>Article 19: Rescind Prior Borrowing Authorizations</i>	Amount for Rescission	Original Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>Unknown</i>	Debt	<i>Pending</i>

“To see if the Town will vote to rescind the unused borrowing authority voted under previous Town Meeting articles...

“DESCRIPTION: State law requires that Town Meeting vote to rescind authorized and unissued debt which is no longer required for its intended purpose.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 14]

At this time, this Committee is not aware of any planned rescissions.

Note: No-longer-needed cash balances from issued debt are not a subject for rescission. Those are normally proposed to Town Meeting for appropriation to later Capital Articles.

<i>Article 20: Establish And Appropriate To Specified Stabilization Funds</i>	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$67,347	Developers	Approval (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to create and/or appropriate sums of money to Stabilization Funds in accordance with Section 5B of Chapter 40 of the Massachusetts General Laws for the purposes of: (a) Section 131 Zoning By-Law, (b) Traffic Mitigation, (c) Transportation Demand Management, (d) School Bus Transportation, (e) Special Education, (f) Center Improvement District; (g) Debt Service, (h) Transportation Management Overlay District (TMO-1) and (i) Avalon Bay School Enrollment Mitigation Fund...

“DESCRIPTION: ...The use of these funds may be appropriated for the specific designated purpose by a two-thirds vote of Town Meeting.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 15]

Of the currently anticipated actions under this Article, this Committee has been advised that only the following two actions are Capital-related.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(b) Traffic Mitigation Stabilization Fund	\$56,667	Developer	Approval (5–0)

These funds are anticipated to be received by March 28, 2011.

<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Amount Requested</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>	<i>Committee Recommends</i>
(h) Transportation Management Overlay District Stabilization Fund	\$10,680	Developer	Approval (5–0)

These funds were received from a developer of property on Harwell Avenue.

<i>Article 21: Appropriate to Stabilization Fund</i>	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>		Indefinite Postponement (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to appropriate a sum of money to the previously created Stabilization Fund...

“DESCRIPTION: ...These funds may later be appropriated, by a two-thirds vote of an Annual or Special Town Meeting, for any lawful purpose.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 15]

At this time, there is not any planned action under this Article.

<i>Article 22: Appropriate from Debt Service Stabilization Fund</i>	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	\$124,057	<i>Debt Service SF</i>	Approval (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to appropriate a sum of money from the Debt Service Stabilization Fund to offset the FY2012 debt service of the bond dated February 1, 2003 issued for additions and renovations to the Lexington High School, Clarke Middle School and Diamond Middle School.

“DESCRIPTION: This article would allow the Town to pay the debt service on the 2003 School Bonds from the Capital Debt Service Stabilization Fund set up for that specific purpose.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 15]

In August 2006, the Town received over \$14 million from the Massachusetts School Building Authority as reimbursement toward the Town’s secondary-schools renovation project. After using over \$11-million of those funds to retire short-term debt taken on in anticipation of that reimbursement, there were \$2,143,079 of excess reimbursement which needed to be applied toward the project’s long-term exempt debt. (By Department of Revenue [DOR] regulations, these funds must be used only to offset debt service on the outstanding bond for that exempt debt.)

With the prior-year appropriations from this fund and, over the same period interest being earned on the amount in the fund, the balance is now \$1,499,107. With continued, yearly, appropriation of this same amount (\$124,057), all the excess reimbursement will have been applied with the payment in FY2023.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

With present balance, that would still leave \$10,423 in the fund, but the residual balance will be higher in FY2023 as a result of interest that will be earned over the next 12.5 years. It is the Town's position that the residual balance should be applied against other exempt debt in FY2024 as the requirement to reserve these funds was to "return" the funds to the taxpayer through the mitigation of exempt debt service.

Article 25: Appropriate for Authorized Capital Improvements	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Pending</i>

"To see if the Town will vote to make supplementary appropriations to be used in conjunction with money appropriated in prior years for the installation or construction of water mains, sewers and sewerage systems, drains, streets, buildings, recreational facilities or other capital improvements and equipment that have heretofore been authorized...

"DESCRIPTION: This is an annual article to request funds for capital improvement project expenditures that exceed the level of appropriation."

[Town of Lexington Warrant for 2011 Annual Town Meeting, Page 16]

At this time, this Committee is not aware of any planned action under this Article.

Article 27: Amend General Bylaws— Private Ways	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	Approval (5–0)

"To see if the Town will vote to amend Chapter 100, Public Ways and Places, of the Code of the Town of Lexington, by adding the following subsection...

"DESCRIPTION: Chapter 40, Section 6N of the Massachusetts General Laws provides that towns may adopt a bylaw for making temporary repairs on private ways. The proposed bylaw would apply to all unaccepted streets shown on the Town's Zoning Maps."

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 17]

Passage of this Bylaw amendment is extremely important as, regardless of the degree of restriction on what, if any, repair work is done on unaccepted streets—or even on strictly "private" roadways, if the current language of the Motion should be revised—it serves two critically important purposes: (1) It limits the Town's liability with regard to actions taken on other-than-Town-owned roadways, and (2) It defines the process and financial responsibilities related to such repair work.

Strictly as background, although the title identifies "Private Ways", the eligibility for any "temporary repairs of private ways" is explicitly qualified by only being applicable, at the very least, to unaccepted streets shown on the Town's Zoning Map. Further, how the roadway is named has no bearing on the term "streets", in this context. Also, there is no change in the common categorization of the roadways in our Town as those having a separate right of way—whether accepted (with the attendant responsibility of the Town to maintain them) or unaccepted (with no Town responsibility regarding them)—or those without such a right of way, called "private", and also with no Town responsibility regarding them (e.g., roadways within a lot[s] containing one or more commercial or non-commercial entity such as a condominium complex or a shopping mall).

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

Article 29: Amend Permanent Building Committee Bylaw	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	Approval (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to amend Section 29-21 of the Code of the Town of Lexington (Permanent Building Committee membership) by adding additional members...

“DESCRIPTION: The proposed amendment would increase the membership of the Permanent Building Committee from its present membership of five.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 19]

Article 30: Amend Bylaw–Town Meeting Procedure	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	Approval (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to amend Sections 118-12 (Motions and Order of Business) and 118-14 (Reconsideration), both in Chapter 118 (Town Meetings), of the Code of the Town of Lexington with regard to the procedures for reopening and reconsideration after an Article shall have been deemed to have been closed by action of Town Meeting...

“DESCRIPTION: (1) To clarify the current language so as to affirm the current practice of Town Meeting; (2) to provide a means by which to eliminate the current need for the routine serving of Notices of Reconsideration on all budget-and-housekeeping-related Motions; (3) to retain the purpose of “reopening” an Article, but in the Section of the Code of the Town of Lexington which prescribes Reconsideration; and (4) to allow sufficient Reconsiderations to adjust for a balanced budget and/or making housekeeping or technical corrections.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 19]

This Committee finds that all four purposes cited in the Article are either of distinct advantage to this Committee (and we believe, in general, as well to Town Meeting) or do not materially change the current practices of Town Meeting with which we agree.

Article 33: Accept State LAND Grant—Cotton Farm Purchase	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	Approval (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to confirm authorization for the Conservation Commission, on behalf of the Town, to apply for and receive funding under the Local Acquisitions for Natural Diversity (LAND) Grant Program of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to reimburse the Town for a portion of the purchase price paid by the Town for the property containing approximately 4.21 acres and consisting of a portion of the land identified on Lexington Assessor’s Map 31 as Lot 60B and a portion of the land identified on Map 31 as Lot 90B, which property is shown as “Lot 1”...

“DESCRIPTION: This article will authorize the Conservation Commission to apply for and receive a grant under the LAND program, Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 132A, Section 22, for the acquisition of the portion of the Cotton Farm purchase authorized under Article 9 of the warrant for the 2010 Annual Town Meeting.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 20]

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE REPORT TO 2011 ATM

Article 34: Approve Battle Green Master Plan	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	Indefinite Postponement (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to approve the Battle Green Master Plan on file with the Town Clerk...

“DESCRIPTION: Over the last two years the community has been engaged in developing a Master Plan to guide design, traffic and uses in the Battle Green area for the foreseeable future. This article will provide an opportunity to comment on the Battle Green Master Plan. The Master Plan may be read online at www.lexingtonma.gov/battlegreenplan.cfm.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 20]

This Committee applauds Indefinite Postponement as we viewed the original request as being an inappropriate, parallel, process to the one underway with the Board of Selectmen.

Article 35: Support and Petition for Municipal Utility Act	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	Approval (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to approve a resolution supporting a refiled version of Bill H4792, “An Act Relative to the Establishment of Municipal Lighting Authorities”; and authorize the Selectmen to petition the General Court for an act substantially similar to Bill H4192 of the 2009-2010 legislative session; or to act in any other manner in relation thereto.

“DESCRIPTION: Following the 2010 Annual Town Meeting's resolution of support for legislation to allow new municipal electric utilities in Massachusetts, the Legislature's Joint Committee on Telecommunications, Utilities and Energy reported that legislation out as Bill H4792 with language changes, but so late that the legislation died in the 2009-10 legislative session (www.malegislature.gov/Bills/Details/8904?generalCourtId=2). This Article allows Town Meeting to support the refiled version of H4792 with improved language for the 2011-12 session and to ask the Selectmen to request Lexington's Representatives in the General Court to refile a home rule petition in the 2011-12 legislative session.”

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 21]

Article 44: Accept Gift of Land—Off Hartwell Avenue	Funds Requested	Funding Source	Committee Recommends
	<i>None</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>	Approval (5–0)

“To see if the Town will vote to accept a gift of land shown as Lot 2 on Assessors' Property Map 80, now or formerly of Pacific Partners Realty Trust...

DESCRIPTION: This article requests the Town to accept the gift of a parcel of land consisting of 14.5 acres, more or less, off Hartwell Avenue. The gift was made in conjunction with the purchase of a portion of the Cotton Farm authorized under Article 9 of the warrant for the 2010 Annual Town Meeting.

[Town of Lexington Warrant to the 2011 ATM, Page 23]

This Committee has been told, and endorses, that this gifted land is to be accepted without any associated designation of the use—which, by default, will mean it's accepted, by default, as general municipal property, and be under the control of the BOS. Although this gift was known it would be made by the seller when the Cotton-Farm property was purchase, this land off Hartwell Avenue was not part of Town Meeting's action authorizing that purchase and, therefore, had no use specified. Any such specified use should be the result of a subsequent action.

Summary of Warrant Article Recommendations (*continued*)

Abbreviations: RF = Revolving Fund; CPF = Community Preservation Fund;

EF = Enterprise Fund; RE = Retained Earnings; GF = General Fund;

SF = Stabilization Fund; TBD = To Be Determined; ATM = Annual Town Meeting

Continued from inside of front cover

Art.	Description	Request	CEC Recommended	Funding Source
13	Public Facilities Capital Projects			
13(a)	Bridge and Bowman Schools Renovation Design, Development and Engineering (<i>Additional</i>)	\$280,000	\$280,000	GF (Debt) Candidate for Debt Exclusion
13(b)	Estabrook School Feasibility and Related Street Access Improvements	\$1,150,000	\$1,150,000	GF (Debt) Candidate for Debt Exclusion
13(c)	School Building Envelope and Systems	\$300,000	\$300,000	GF (Free Cash)
13(d)	School Improvement Projects	\$645,000	\$645,000	\$325,000 GF (Debt) + \$320,000 GF (Free Cash)
13(e)	Clarke Middle School Paving Improvements	\$125,000	\$125,000	GF (Debt)
13(f)	Lexington High School Roof Repair	\$659,678	\$659,678	\$659,678 GF (Debt) [plus \$338,322 Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) for a total of \$998,000]
13(g)	Hastings School Playground Expansion	\$75,000	\$75,000	GF (Debt)
13(h)	School Paving Program	\$50,000	\$50,000	GF (Free Cash)
13(i)	Diamond Middle School [Modular] Extraordinary Repair	\$75,000	\$75,000	GF (Free Cash)
13(j)	Municipal Building Envelope and Systems	\$165,572	\$165,572	\$165,572 GF (Cash)
13(k)	Repair of Fire Station Floor	\$450,000	\$450,000	GF (Debt)
13(l)	Library Material Handling System Design	\$100,000	\$100,000	GF (Free Cash)
14	Street Acceptance—Frances Road	\$200,000	\$200,000	Assessment of Betterments
15	Appropriate for Community Center	<i>Unknown</i>	Indefinite Postponement	<i>Unknown</i>
17	Reduce Community Preservation Act (CPA) Surcharge	<i>None</i>	Disapproval	<i>Not Applicable</i>
19	Rescind Prior Borrowing Authorizations	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Pending</i>	Debt
20	Establish and Appropriate to Specified Stabilization Funds	\$67,347	\$67,347	Developers
21	Appropriate to Stabilization Fund	<i>None</i>	Indefinite Postponement	<i>Not Applicable</i>
22	Appropriate from Debt Service Stabilization Fund	\$124,057	\$124,057	Debt Service SF
25	Appropriate for Authorized Capital Improvements	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Pending</i>	<i>Unknown</i>
27	Amend General Bylaws—Private Ways	<i>None</i>	Approval	<i>Not Applicable</i>
29	Amend Permanent Building Committee Bylaw	<i>None</i>	Approval	<i>Not Applicable</i>
30	Amend Bylaw—Town Meeting Procedure	<i>None</i>	Approval	<i>Not Applicable</i>
33	Accept State LAND Grant—Cotton Farm Purchase	<i>None</i>	Approval	State Grant
34	Approve Battle Green Master Plan	<i>None</i>	Indefinite Postponement	<i>Not Applicable</i>
35	Support and Petition for Municipal Utility Act	<i>None</i>	Approval	<i>Not Applicable</i>
44	Accept Gift of Land—Off Hartwell Avenue	<i>None</i>	Approval	<i>Not Applicable</i>