

Comprehensive Capital Budget Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Friday, March 10, 2023

Location – Remote Meeting on Zoom

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
BELMONT, MA

DATE: March 27, 2023

TIME: 8:55 AM

Members present: Pat Bruschi, Aaron Pikilingis, Adam Dash, Larry Link, Catherine Bowen, Melinda Huang, Chris Doyle, Susan Burgess-Cox

Members absent: Claus Becker

Other attendees: Jennifer Hewitt, Belmont Assistant Town Administrator; L. Pargoli

[Chair Chris Doyle called meeting to order at 7:31am]

Agenda

1. Minutes
 - a. No minutes to review
2. Spring calendar & key dates
 - a. C. Doyle reviewed an excel file -- CCBC_Calendar 2022-2023.xlsx -- containing upcoming calendar information, highlighting key dates of upcoming committee meetings and report milestones
[C. Bowen joined the meeting at 7:34am]
 - i. C. Doyle notes that A. Dash and C. Bowen, as appointees from other committees for which they are not seeking reelection, will rotate off the CCBC on April 5
 1. C. Bowen offered to help by continuing to attend meetings through this transition
 - ii. C. Doyle also noted dates where our committee will need to take key votes
 - iii. P. Bruschi suggests separating policy votes from votes on our report, warrant items, etc. to make sure we have voted on approved wording, etc.
 - b. Discussion: Meeting schedule after remote meeting law expires on 3/31
3. Capital Stabilization Fund proposal
 - a. J. Hewitt provided context and an overview of the concept of establishing and funding a new Capital Stabilization Fund
 - i. Town Meeting must authorize the use of any funds coming into the town for purposes *other than* the General Fund
 - ii. Proposal: Identify specific instances where incoming funds like rebates for energy investments are going into the general fund but could come back to the Capital Budget
 1. Next step: develop reasonably narrow language to dedicate this kind of funding gets allocated back to the capital budget by putting it into a Capital Stabilization Fund, perhaps requiring approval of a body such as the Select Board

2. Similar approach could be applied for funds like proceeds on sales of capital assets (vehicles, property, modulars, etc.)
3. C. Bowen asks whether this language could include language covering the use of funds (e.g. money from energy investments would be dedicated to future energy projects)
 - a. J. Hewitt explains that the main issue is that these types of funds fall to the General Fund
 - b. C. Bowen suggests that we might include language to restrict the use based on the source
 - c. L. Link argues for maximum flexibility, fewest restrictions on the funds
4. A. Pikilingis asks if this allocation to a capital stabilization fund requires approval from Town Meeting
 - a. Town Meeting would approve the *rule* for putting money into the stabilization funds, allowing the funds to be allocated to the fund
 - b. Using the funds would require a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote of Town Meeting
- iii. C. Doyle clarifies if it would be helpful if the Committee expressed formal support for this effort
 1. A. Dash says it might be helpful to the Select Board, but not absolutely necessary
4. CCBC Report outline and signups
 - a. **C. Doyle will connect with members individually about contributions to the report**
5. Update project ranking results
 - a. M. Huang provided an overview of the output of the project prioritization tool exercise in the file *Project Prioritization 2023-03-08.xlsx*
 - i. Highlighted changes include funding broken out by funding source (general fund, enterprise fund, bond, dedicated override)
 - ii. A few of the funding amounts are in the incorrect column, **M. Huang will adjust for our next meeting**
 - b. Review and discussion of the funding request rankings
 - i. M. Huang pointed out a project example where the rankings had a large degree of variability between committee members and noted that projects like that may be good places for more discussion
 - c. C. Doyle shared file *DRAFT Capital Project List - 2-27-23.xlsx*
 - i. Discussion: Which projects requests should we fund, if not all?
 - ii. J. Hewitt suggests spending the money down
 - iii. J. Hewitt notes that the first phase of bonding for the library and, if it passes, the rink, would begin in the Spring of 2024, which is also when we would bond the pumper truck (and other potential requests funded through bonding)

1. J. Hewitt notes that the library's second phase will be bonded in Spring 2025
 - a. This provides an opportunity to take on additional bonding for a "smaller" project like the CMS Boiler

[L. Pargol joined the meeting at 8:10am]

- iv. Discussion: Whether we fund all the project requests
 1. P. Brusch clarifies that we are not obliged to fund everything just because we have sufficient funding
 2. A. Pikcilingis notes that the amount we bond this year will run against other future projects in future years
 - a. L. Link lists some considerations for weighing projects in current and future years
 - b. C. Bowen notes that the sidewalk and building assessment efforts may reveal future capital needs that are not currently on our list
 3. Discussion: the efficacy of security cameras, vestibules as a deterrent (security vestibules are much more effective vs. cameras)
 4. P. Brusch: there was a past comprehensive effort by the Warrant Committee to understand the list of vehicles, their use, age, etc. and it would be helpful to do this again to help prioritize future requests to fund vehicles (> 9 years ago)
 - a. A. Pikcilingis notes that we have gaps in knowledge of our fleet of vehicles -- we have a list without details on age, hours, mileage, repair costs, etc.
 - b. For the future, it would be helpful for all funding considerations (operating, capital, etc.) to have a comprehensive list of vehicles, their age/condition, use, etc.
 5. C. Doyle suggests that we should proceed with funding all requests as outlined in our project list and there are no objections
6. Tentative FY24 capital project list
 - a. This topic covered in the discussion of the previous agenda item.
7. Potential ARPA fund usage recommendation
 - a. Discussion: Making a formal recommendation to use ARPA funding for security to vestibules
 - i. Discussion: Using ARPA funding
 - ii. L. Link moves to approve the use of ARPA funding in the total of \$245,000: \$170,000 for security cameras (project FAC-24-04) and \$75,000 for school security vestibules (project FAC-24-06)
 1. Second: P. Brusch
 2. Vote:
 - a. Larry - yes
 - b. Pat - yes

- c. Adam - yes
 - d. C. Bowen - yes
 - e. C. Doyle - Yes
 - f. Aaron - Yes
 - g. Susan - Yes
 - h. Melinda - Yes
 - i. C. Becker - Not present
- 8. Updates from other committees
 - a. L. Link provided a brief overview of the Energy Committee's process. No actions are necessary at this time
- 9. Public Comment
 - a. L. Pargoli expresses her concern that there are projects being used to fund projects at the schools given the allocation of funding and notes concerns about the allocation of funds to the town versus the school department
 - i. P. Brusch clarifies which schools (not the high school) will have vestibules added and notes that capital needs in town, including the school budget
 - ii. C. Doyle suggests that our report include information to indicate, by department, where funding has been allocated, including details on the schools.
 - iii. C. Doyle provided clarification about how the ARPA funding has been allocated, including the portion allocated to the Capital budget
 - iv. A. Dash provided an overview of the process and rules for dedicating these funds to and allocating them from the Capital Budget

[Meeting adjourned at 9:09am]

Motion: P. Brusch

Second: L. Link

Vote accepted by unanimous consent

Scheduled Upcoming meetings:

- Friday 3/17