<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Consent Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes to approve: February 1, 2021; February 1, 2021 Executive Session (not to be released); February 8, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proclamation: Race Amity Day – June 13, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Town Manager’s Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Chair’s Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Junction Village Park Pedestrian Safety Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Nashoba Regional Greenways Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Town Manager’s FY22 Budget &amp; Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Committee Nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Committee Liaison Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Public Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
TOWN OF CONCORD
SELECT BOARD

PROCLAMATION

RACE AMITY DAY

WHEREAS Concord supports the Great Seal of the United States of America which bears the inscription, E Pluribus Unum, which translates from Latin as “Out of many, one”; and

WHEREAS The greatest asset of the Town of Concord is its people; and

WHEREAS The Town of Concord is comprised of multicultural, multiethnic and multiracial citizens; and

WHEREAS Friendship, collegiality, civility, respect, and kindness are commonly shared ideals of the collective citizenry of the Town of Concord; and

WHEREAS The Towards E Pluribus Unum Initiative has invited communities across the United States of America to join in introspection and reflection on the beauty and richness of the diverse people of this great nation while reaching out with a spirit of amity toward one another annually on the second Sunday in June; and

WHEREAS H. 2745, Chapter 163 of Acts of 2015 of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts establishes the Second Sunday in June Annually as Race Amity Day; and

NOW THEREFORE We, the Concord Select Board, do hereby proclaim June 13th, 2021, to be Race Amity Day, and urge all the citizens of the Town to take cognizance of this event and participate fittingly in its observance.

Proclaimed this 15th day of March

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

CONCORD SELECT BOARD
Pursuant to notice duly filed with the Town Clerk, the Concord Select Board convened in a meeting via video conference call on February 1, 2021 at 4:00pm.

Present were Linda Escobedo, Chair; Susan Bates, Clerk; Terri Ackerman, Jane Hotchkiss, and Matthew Johnson. Also present was Stephen Crane, Town Manager.

Call to Order

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Present
Ms. Ackerman: Present
Ms. Bates: Present
Ms. Hotchkiss: Present
Mr. Johnson: Present

Consent Agenda
- Minutes to approve: December 7, 2020; December 21, 2020; December 28, 2020

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to approve the consent agenda.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

Town Manager’s Report

Town Manager Stephen Crane reported that the Town will only be receiving 100 doses per week from the Department of Public Health, so the Town is planning for micro-clinics to be held at Harvey Wheeler at 55 Church Street. Mr. Crane asked residents to monitor the Town website and News & Notices for any updates on the vaccine rollout.

The guardrail replacement on Annursnac Hill Road is nearly halfway complete. Engineering staff have been working closely with the Water and Sewer Division because of the close proximity of the guardrail to the existing water main on the road.

A third party software developer, Corson GIS Solutions, has been working with CPW staff on the development of a new work order management system for CPW.
The partnership formed between the CCHS student senate and Concord Together has resulted in 23 student volunteers that will be paired with local businesses to assist with improved online profiles. Tasks include improved websites, social media campaigns, and online sales.

Chair’s Remarks

Select Board Chair Linda Escobedo noted that the Select Board is acutely aware of residents’ concerns surrounding the vaccine rollout, particularly for the town’s seniors.

Representative Gouveia has filed HB273, the legislation for the additional special liquor licenses approved at 2020 Town Meeting, as well as HB274, the senior means tested tax exemption approved at 2020 Town Meeting.

Review Innholder License Application by Best Western Hotel LLC, d/b/a Best Western at Historic Concord, located at 740 Elm Street

The Select Board previously voted on January 11 to issue Best Western an innholder license, after discovering that they had been operating without the proper licensure. At that time, the Select Board issued the license on the condition that a representative of the business would attend the February 1 meeting. Deepak Ninan, owner of Best Western in Concord, attended to explain that they did not know they were supposed to have the innholder license due to change of ownership that had occurred several years prior. Once the Town Manager’s Office notified them that they did not have the proper license, they returned the completed paperwork for the innholder license within one business day. The Select Board determined that they would issue the penalty of a $100.00 fine as allowable under state statute for the business not having the proper licensure.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to authorize the Town Manager’s Office to issue a fine of $100.00 as described in the state statute to Best Western at Historic Concord.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye
Continued Public Hearing: Application for a New On-Premises Section 12 Wine and Malt Beverages Annual License by RK Wing Corp, d/b/a Rossini’s Pizzeria and Restaurant located at 206 Fitchburg Turnpike

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to continue the public hearing.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

On January 11, the Select Board held a public hearing regarding the new liquor license application from Rossini’s. At that meeting, the Select Board noted the Police Department’s recommendation to not issue the license to Rossini’s due to past incidences of non-compliance with the local and state requirements. The Select Board voted to continue the public hearing until February 1, and instructed the Town Manager’s Office and Police Department to meet with Rossini’s ownership to develop a plan for compliance for the business. The memo summarizing this meeting was included in the meeting materials.

Rossini’s owner Rafael Borges and proposed manager of record Lecilia De Souza attended the meeting on behalf of Rossini’s. Mr. Borges explained that they appreciated the responsibility that came with holding a liquor license, and vowed that they would be in compliance with the local and state requirements if a license were to be issued. Senior Administrative Assistant Jeremy Romanul and Police Chief Joseph O’Connor summarized the meeting that took place with Rossini’s and stated that they were prepared to work with the applicant should the Select Board issue the license.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to close the public hearing.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to approve the application for a new On-Premises Section 12 Wine and Malt Beverages Annual License by RK Wing Corp, d/b/a Rossini’s Pizzeria and Restaurant located at 206 Fitchburg Turnpike.
COVID-19 Vaccine Update and Roll-out Challenges – Health Director Susan Rask

Health Director Susan Rask explained that the Town of Concord was scheduled to receive only 100 doses per week of the COVID-19 vaccine from the Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

Ms. Rask has been working closely with the Council on Aging to set up a vaccine clinic, tentatively scheduled to begin on February 10. Alternatively, they may decide to offer the vaccine to residents of the Concord Housing Authority, but the Town does not have the supply to do both at the same time. Ms. Rask ordered 100 doses of the vaccine, which are scheduled to arrive February 10. Ms. Rask will be ordering 100 doses per week each week in February.

Emerson Hospital will begin holding vaccine clinics in mid-February for patients of their primary care physicians.

Ms. Rask explained that for reasons she does not understand, the federal government is currently not distributing the amount of vaccines to Massachusetts that the state has the capacity to administer. The State is then deciding to focus on distributing the vaccines to mass vaccination sites rather than to the municipalities or hospitals.

The vaccination locations and eligibility requirements are continuously being updated and are available on the Department of Public Health website.

Discuss Patriots’ Day Celebrations

Julissica Navarro-Norton, Chair of the Public Ceremonies and Celebrations Committee, attended to discuss the options for the Patriots’ Day celebrations. Ms. Navarro-Norton noted that surrounding communities are moving their Patriots’ Day celebrations to a virtual format. Ms. Navarro-Norton will be working with the Town Manager's Office to determine how to adapt the celebrations for this year in a COVID-safe manner.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to cancel the in-person Patriots’ Day public events, as all events will be virtual.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

**Letter to Request Commemorative Stamps for 250th Celebration**

The Select Board is beginning to think about the celebrations for the 250th anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord and the Declaration of Independence in 2025-2026. Resident and former Select Board member Michael Lawson attended the meeting to explain that in preparation, the Select Board should issue a letter to request commemorative stamps for the 250th celebrations, as was done for the 150th and 200th celebrations. The letter for this request was included in the meeting materials.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to authorize the Chair to sign a letter as described to be submitted by Michael Lawson to the Citizens’ Stamp Advisory Committee requesting commemorative stamps for the 250th anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord.

**Roll call vote**
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

**Committee Nominations**

There were no committee nominations.

**Committee Appointments:**

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to appoint Joseph Rogers of 20 Tracy Street to the Agriculture Committee as an Associate Member for a term to expire April 30, 2022

**Roll call vote**
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Committee Liaison Reports

Ms. Bates attended the Planning Board, where they had a joint meeting with the Regional Housing Services Office, Concord Housing Authority, Concord Housing Development Corporation, and Concord Housing Foundation. The purpose of this joint meeting was to discuss their common goals and how they can support each other. The Planning Board also discussed potential articles for the 2021 Town Meeting. The Council on Aging heard a presentation from the NMI-Starmet Reuse Planning Committee. The Conservation Restriction Stewardship Committee discussed the conservation restrictions on properties around town, and discussed the new GIS monitoring technology the Town is using. The Personnel Board is looking at ways to reassess their role and understand the role of other Personnel Boards in other communities with a strong Town Manager form of government.

Mr. Johnson attended the Housing Authority, where they approved spending for renovations.

Ms. Hotchkiss attended the Climate Action Advisory Board discussed the non-binding climate resolution they will be asking the Select Board to consider at a coming meeting. CAAB is also preparing a warrant article for 2021 Town Meeting attempting to limit the use of fossil fuel infrastructure in new construction. CAAB also discussed CMLP’s decarbonization plan. The White Pond Advisory Committee is looking to update the 2015 vision for White Pond that their committee put together. The White Pond Public Forum will take place on February 9 at 6:00pm.

Ms. Escobedo attended the Town Caucus on January 25th. The Trustees of Town Donations reviewed their charge, as they were asked to consider an expansion on their charge. The Tax Fairness Committee met, and since then the Senior Tax Exemption was filed with the legislature.

Miscellaneous Correspondence

There was no additional correspondence reported on.

Public Comments

Tanya Gailus of 62 Prescott Road commented that in relation to the Concord 2025 Committee, it is wonderful to acknowledge the contribution of artistic projects and stated that if they committee size does stay in the range of 13-15 members, perhaps there should be two people representing the artistic community. Additionally, Ms. Gailus stated that it may be beneficial to include someone on the committee with expertise on the Native American residents of Concord both in the past and presently.
Adjourn to Executive Session, not to return to open session, with respect to non-union contract negotiations for the Town Manager, as an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the Town, and the chair so declares.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to adjourn to Executive Session, not to return to open session, with respect to non-union contract negotiations for the Town Manager, as an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the Town, and the chair so declares.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

Minuteman Media Network Coverage: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ih_zPJVb3Ii

Meeting Documents: https://concordma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/27819/February-1-SB-Packet
Pursuant to notice duly filed with the Town Clerk, the Concord Select Board convened in a meeting via video conference call on February 1, 2021 at 4:00pm.

Present were Linda Escobedo, Chair; Susan Bates, Clerk; Terri Ackerman, Jane Hotchkiss, and Matthew Johnson. Also present was Stephen Crane, Town Manager.

Call to Order

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Present
Ms. Ackerman: Present
Ms. Bates: Present
Ms. Hotchkiss: Present
Mr. Johnson: Present

Consent Agenda

- Town Accountant Warrants – February 4, 2021
- Gift Acceptance
  o The Umbrella Arts Center $1500.00 Drive-in Movie Event
  o The Rotary Club of Concord $1500.00 Drive-in Movie Event

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to approve the consent agenda.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

Town Manager’s Report

Town Manager Stephen Crane reported that the first of the vaccine micro-clinics will take place at the Harvey Wheeler Center on Wednesday, February 10 from 1-4PM. The clinic is full and registration is closed. Given the feedback about seniors and limited access to or proficiency with the internet, the COA and Health Department accepted reservations by phone. The volume of calls disrupted the phone system for a number of Town departments. In addition to conducting the micro-clinics, Town staff continue to pursue any and all options to increase the amount of vaccine available.

The third White Pond public forum was rescheduled due to the snowstorm. It will now be held on Tuesday, February 9 at 6PM via zoom.
National Grid has informed the Engineering Division that they plan to start construction on a new gas main on Bedford Court as soon as the second week of February 2021.

CPW operations crew began winter storm response activities on Tuesday, February 2 around 11 AM. The conditions deteriorated throughout the night as heavy, wet snow began to accumulate with wind gusts reaching 30mph. The storm ended Tuesday morning around 11 AM dropping a total of 20 inches of snow. CPW crews continued to work on cleanup throughout the day. Snow removal operations in the downtown and West Concord business districts began at 8 PM Wednesday evening. This work continued through the night, and was completed by 7 AM Thursday morning. The cost of this storm through Thursday morning was about $124,019.03, which includes labor and supplies.

The work on the FY22 Budget is ongoing with the initial review of department requests.

First round interviews for the Land Manager position are being conducted this week.

**Chair’s Remarks**

Ms. Escobedo thanked the Town and Public Information Officer Erin Stevens in particular for the adaptations and outreach being made in regards to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

There will not be a Select Board meeting next week due to the Presidents’ Day holiday on February 15.

The Town Meeting Preview Meeting will take place on Saturday, February 27.

**Middle School Building Committee Presentation**

Middle School Building Committee co-chair’s Pat Nelson, Dawn Guarriello, Superintendent Dr. Hunter, and SMMA consultant Kristen Olson attended to present on the current status of the Middle School Building Committee project. The full presentation is available in the meeting materials.

**Resolution for a Just Transition to Building Decarbonization in the Commonwealth**

Sustainability Director Kate Hanley and Climate Action Advisory Board Chair Jake Swenson attended to present the resolution for the Select Board’s consideration. CAAB is looking for the Select Board to submit this resolution to the state legislature, Governor, and state agencies. The goal of the resolution is to call for a commitment to a just transition away from fossil fuels to decarbonization of buildings in Massachusetts by acting at the state-level and allowing rapid
municipal action.

Select Board members were in support of the resolution, and noted that they were looking forward to taking additional action to advance the Town’s climate action goals moving forward.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to endorse a non-binding resolution “A Resolution Calling for the Massachusetts State Legislature, Massachusetts Governor, Department of Public Utilities, Board of Building Regulations and Standards, and the Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development to commit to a just transition to building decarbonization in the Commonwealth.”

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

Concord 2025 Executive Committee Draft #3

Ms. Escobedo prepared a new draft for the Concord 2025 Executive Committee.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to approve the Concord 2025 Executive Committee Charge as presented and amended today.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

This committee is now accepting volunteers for this committee. Residents can submit green cards on the Town website: https://concordma.gov/739/Vacancies---Member-Positions

Committee Nominations

There were no committee nominations.

Committee Liaison Reports
Ms. Bates attended the Economic Vitality Committee, where they discussed options to allow outdoor dining beyond the COVID-19 Pandemic. This will likely require bylaw changes. The Town is applying for tourism recovery grants, and is partnering with Lexington for a campaign to attract visitors from 50 miles away and beyond. CCHS students are collaborating with businesses to help develop their websites, social media, and e-commerce. The Cemetery Committee had a presentation from Boston Scanning, who is working on digitizing all of the cemetery records. The Board of Assessors reviewed abatement applications, and is increasing the frequency of their meetings to review the applications in a timely manner. The Concord Business Partnership met and heard information from the Town Manager and Chief Financial Officer regarding the upcoming budget.

Ms. Ackerman attended the Concord Cultural Council, where they are reviewing applications for grant funding. They plan to vote on these applications next week. The Library Committee met and discussed their administrative code, where they are preparing revisions for the Select Board to consider at an upcoming meeting. There is a vacancy on the Library Committee. The Library is preparing budget requests related to staffing. The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Advisory Committee met, where they reported that the steel bridge over Route 2 is expected to be completed this summer. The BFRTAC is working hard on the last half mile on the southern portion of town in coordination with the Sudbury team. They received a community connections grant for bike racks and shelters to be located in West Concord near the train station.

Mr. Johnson attended the NMI-Starmet Reuse Committee, where they spent most of the meeting reviewing the draft executive summary of their report. The committee is encouraging feedback from residents, and Mr. Johnson advised that residents review the draft report and make their comments known to the committee. The Housing Authority now has three candidates for each of the three open seats that will be filled at the upcoming Town Election on March 25. The Housing Authority has received many applications for the Executive Director role.

Ms. Hotchkiss attended the Natural Resources Commission, where they continue to review the Middlesex Schools proposed turf fields. The NRC began to discuss the 50-foot no build policy to develop greater consistency in how this policy is applied. The NRC discussed the future of the Town’s policy on neonicotinoids. The White Pond Public Forum will take place at 6:00pm on February 9th. The Historic Districts Commission met and discussed the new ownership of the Hawthorne Inn, which is being converted to a private residence. There was continued discussion of Jenny Dugan Road as a historic district, as well as an expansion of the Main Street historic district.

Ms. Escobedo attended the Financial Audit Advisory Committee, where they discussed the management letter for the 2020 Town Audit. The auditors will be coming to the Select Board to present the audit at an upcoming meeting. The Finance Committee reviewed the FY22 Budget Guidelines, which were also included in the Select Board’s meeting materials.

Miscellaneous Correspondence
The Select Board received correspondence from a group of citizens supporting the Finance Committee’s decision not to use funding from the Legal Reserve Fund for the Estabrook Road litigation in 2020. The Board also received correspondence from The West Concord Cultural Commission regarding signage and pedestrian and bicycle safety at Junction Park.

Public Comments

Todd Benjamin of Sudbury Road asked how the Select Board is supporting Concord families in getting kids back to school as soon as possible. Ms. Escobedo responded that that is foremost in the minds of the School District, and the Select Board will do what they can to help them accomplish this as soon as it is feasible and safe.

Diane Proctor of 57 Sudbury Road asked the Select Board to highlight how residents can access the electronic green cards for committee volunteers. Residents can fill out a green card highlighting their interest in volunteering on the Town website: https://concordma.gov/739/Vacancies---Member-Positions

Adjourn

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, it was UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to adjourn.

Roll call vote
Ms. Escobedo: Aye
Ms. Ackerman: Aye
Ms. Bates: Aye
Ms. Hotchkiss: Aye
Mr. Johnson: Aye

Minuteman Media Network Coverage: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wUgnspxd5sE

Meeting Materials: https://concordma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/27975/February-8-SB-Packet
MEMORANDUM

To: Chair Escobedo and Members of the Board

From: Stephen Crane, Town Manager

Date: March 15, 2021

Re: Town Manager Report

Vaccine Update

The Council on Aging and Health Division staff were delighted to hear from the West Concord Pharmacy that they had 50 doses of COVID vaccine available and offered to provide the vaccine for Concord seniors. A mini-clinic is being scheduled. This type of community partnership has been one of the many successes in the Town’s pandemic response.

Additionally, the effort to establish a nine-town regional vaccination clinic continues as feedback on the application is received from DPH. The health directors and emergency managers in the towns (Acton, Bedford, Carlisle, Concord, Lincoln, Maynard, Sudbury, Wayland, and Westford) have been meeting to discuss logistics including locations, administrative support, supply management, and clinic staffing. Updates will be provided as information comes in on this important effort.

CPW

Nagog Pond Water Rights: The Supreme Judicial Court (“SJC”) issued its decision on Littleton and Acton’s appeal of the Land Court decision holding that the Water Management Act impliedly repealed the 1884 Act which gave priority water rights to Nagog Pond to those two towns. The SJC upheld the Land Court’s decision that Littleton and Acton’s priority rights in Section 10 of the 1884 Act were repugnant to the registration system established in the WMA. This decision provides assurance to Concord that continued stewardship and improvements associated with this important water resource will not be at risk.

2021 Roads Program Out to Bid: Engineering has put out to bid a contract for roadway reconstruction including pavement reclamation, milling and overlaying for the neighborhood that includes Prescott Road, Peter Spring Road, Arrowhead Road, Minuteman Drive, and Cranefield Road. Last Fall, a major utility project to replace the water main occurred on these streets. It is anticipated that the road work will be completed during the coming construction season.

CPW Health & Safety Program: CPW kicked-off its renewed Health & Safety program project this week holding its first meeting with EBI, a third party consultant. The CPW project team included employees from all divisions of public works. The team will be working with EBI to
develop new Occupational Health & Safety programs for the department, which will include revamped safety trainings.

Spring Recycling Event: Information on spring recycling events has been posted on the Solid Waste Division webpage at www.concordma.gov/recycle. These events include bulbs and battery recycling, Styrofoam block recycling, electronics recycling, paper shredding, and hazardous waste collection.

**DPLM**

**RHSO update:** The Advisory Committee representing the nine towns participating in the Regional Housing Services Office attended the quarterly meeting and heard from Chris Kluchman (from DHCD) and Eric Shupin (from CHAPA) about recent Zoning Reforms included in the State’s Economic Development legislation regarding Housing Choice and MBTA communities. Also discussed are the Fair Housing initiatives recommended in the WestMetro HOME Consortium and an update of the current RHSO activities.

Assabet River Pedestrian Bridge design: The contract with Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. is being finalized and information updated on the Planning Division web page concerning design and permitting for the Assabet River Pedestrian Bridge. Certain aspects of the work need to be completed by June 30, 2021 to meet the requirements of the MassTrails grant received last year.

MBTA appeals DEP determination re: tree removal: The Natural Resources Division was informed that the MBTA has appealed DEP’s determination regarding tree removal along the MBTA right-of-way and has combined Concord’s decision with 23 other communities and 3 regional DEP offices.

**IT**

A significant of time was spent dealing with the aftermath of the widely-discussed Exchange vulnerability by searching for indicators of compromise and applying recommended mitigations. Much of that time was the continued documentation and clean-up after a network outage suffered the week before as well as the submission of a corrective action plan to the Town Manager. The Department also prepared for enrollment into the State’s Cybersecurity Awareness Training program, which will commence later this month (information will be sent to all users in the program by next week) and successfully wrapped up the security camera upgrade at the Beede Center, including an upgrade of our primary video surveillance software. Finally, IT assisted the Light Plant with their VIN number analysis to determine the number of hybrid and electric in Concord and continued to work with Public Works on a plan to redesign their SCADA system.

**Facilities**

Filed sub-bids for the Gerow Park restrooms were received and viewed on Friday March 5. There were eight in total. Four roof and flashing, two electrical and two plumbing. No award has been granted yet as estimates are still under review.

On March 9-10, Facilities Director Ryan Orr took two OSHA training courses to gain additional knowledge about health and safety that were geared toward the prevention of accidents from occurring and how to react when they do occur. These two courses are just two of the eight he will be attending.
With the help of the Sustainability Director and Facilities Coordinator, the Town submitted a request for use of funding from the Sawyer Trust Fund to help with the replacement of HVAC equipment at both 141 Keyes Road and Police and Fire 209 Walden Street. 141 Keyes Road will be a complete replacement of old and worn gas fired air handlers with electric heat pumps. 209 Walden Street will consist of replacing a 7.5 ton gas fired AHU in the third floor meeting room with an electric heat pump. The goal is to have an RFQ out by April 15 and work completed by June 15.

Parks and Playground crew are continuing to paint at the Police Department while patiently waiting for the weather to warm up so they can get back outside to begin their spring cleaning. They have also responded to and made necessary repairs for several no heat calls and hot water tank failures over the past couple weeks.
Junction Park and BFRT - Dismount Zones

Dismount Zone B

Dismount Zone B
Photos of proposed Dismount Zone approaching Junction Park and Main Street from the South.
Commuter Rail and BFRT

- Photos of proposed Dismount Zone and locations for additional signage north of the commuter rail line.
Pavement Markings
ARTICLE. That the Town raise and appropriate the sum of $45,757,766, transfer $229,038 from the Cemetery Fund, transfer $257,606 from the Sewer Fund, transfer $710,034 from the Water Fund, transfer $582,347 from the Light Fund, transfer $137,908 from the Solid Waste Fund, transfer $28,875 from the Telecom Fund, transfer $88,150 from the Emergency Services Stabilization Fund, transfer $1,978 from PEG Access Fund and transfer a total of $867,564 from 10-ATM-2020, for a total appropriation under Article xx of $48,661,266, as printed in the handout, as Fiscal 2022 Proposal, Items 1 – 16, for the necessary and expedient purposes of the Town for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2022, and that the same be expended only for such purposes under the direction of the Town Manager; and further, that the Town Manager is authorized to turn in or sell at public auction surplus equipment, the amount allowed or received therefore to be applied against the purchase of new equipment; and that the Town appropriate and transfer the sum of $1,000 from the Dog Inoculation Fees Reserve Account for the cost of the Board of Health’s Rabies Clinic; and $3,500 from Transportation Network Fees to support transportation related programs; and further that the Town appropriate $115,331 from the Title 5 Septic Loan Betterment Reserve Account to meet the loan payments to the Massachusetts Clean Water Trust due and payable during FY2022.
# Summary of Budget Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation:</th>
<th>Funding:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline, excluding capital</td>
<td>$ 28,162,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Appropriation</td>
<td>$ 330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A Group Insurance</td>
<td>$ 6,639,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 B OPEB</td>
<td>$ 1,220,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 C Property/Liability</td>
<td>$ 315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Unemployment &amp; Workers Compensation</td>
<td>$ 253,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Retirement</td>
<td>$ 3,412,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Social Security &amp; Medicare</td>
<td>$ 919,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A Debt Service, within Levy</td>
<td>$ 4,167,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 B Debt Service, Excluded</td>
<td>$ 3,750,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Town Budget Article</td>
<td>$ 48,661,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 229,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Additional Appropriations:             |                        |
| Dog Inoculation                        | $ 1,000                | Dog Inoculation     |
| TKN                                    | $ 3,500                | $ 3,000            |
| Septic Loans                           | $ 115,331              | TKN                 |
|                                        | $ 115,331              | Septic Betterment  |
| Total: Budget Article $ 48,781,097     | Total Revenue to support Article: $ 48,781,097 |

| Reconciliation:                        |                        |
| PY22 Guideline                         | $ 28,962,895           |
| less: Cash Capital (different article)  | ($800,000)             |
| add: additional non-property tax supported expense | $ 330,000        |
| add: Non-Guidelines Expense            | $ 20,168,372           |
| add: Dog Inoculation                   | $ 1,000                |
| add: Transportation Network Fee Program| $ 3,500                |
| add: Septic Loan Payments              | $ 115,331              |
|                                        | $ 46,781,098           |
FY22 Budget Timetable

• November 6, 2020: FY22 – 26 Capital Plan Instructions issued
• December 4, 2020: FY22 – 26 Capital Plan requests due
• December 31, 2020: FY22 Budget Instructions issued to departments
• January 14, 2021: Town Manager response to FY22 Guidelines Information Request
• January 21, 2021: FinCom sets FY22 Preliminary Guideline
• January 27, 2021: departmental requests due
• Jan 29 – Feb 9: review of requests by Town Manager/ Finance
• February 4, 2021: Town Manager response to FY22 Preliminary Guideline
• February 12: all operating & capital requests compiled for final review
• February 25, 2021: FinCom sets FY22 Final Guideline
• February 27, 2021: 2021 Annual Town Meeting Preview Meeting
• March 5: Preliminary FY22 Operating Budget & Capital Plan issued
• March 15: Preliminary FY22 Operating Budget & Capital Plan presented to Select Board
• March 25: Final FY22 Operating Budget & Capital Plan published
FY22 Budget Drivers

- **Category 1, Covid-19:**
  - Temporary - economic vitality efforts, facilitation of remote meetings
  - Permanent - custodial services, costs to facilitate remote work

- **Category 2, Cyber Security:**
  - Office 365, hardware upgrades

- **Category 3, planned increase in service levels:**
  - Library Expansion, Facilities, on-going Economic Vitality; Legal Expense

- **Category 4, new service level requests:**
  - Increased hours for rangers; additional services RHSO; structural changes at CPW/Park & Trees division

- **Category 5, Contractual & Inflationary increases:**
  - Salaries, utilities
## Budget Drivers

### By Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Increase</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
<th>% Increase over FY21</th>
<th>% Increase over FY20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1- Covid</td>
<td>$ 370,039</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2- Cyber Security</td>
<td>$ 154,113</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3- Planned Service Level Increase</td>
<td>$ 230,274</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4- New Requests</td>
<td>$ 258,995</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5- Contractual, Fixed or Mandatory</td>
<td>$ 875,741</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total:</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,889,162</td>
<td>6.74%</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Cost Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Govt Subtotal</td>
<td>4,026,648</td>
<td>4,074,637</td>
<td>4,827,980</td>
<td>753,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Subtotal</td>
<td>2,373,592</td>
<td>2,420,349</td>
<td>2,293,366</td>
<td>(126,983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPLM Subtotal</td>
<td>1,858,940</td>
<td>1,878,215</td>
<td>1,951,469</td>
<td>73,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services Subtotal</td>
<td>3,445,273</td>
<td>3,492,472</td>
<td>3,682,509</td>
<td>190,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Subtotal</td>
<td>10,212,263</td>
<td>10,623,630</td>
<td>10,586,207</td>
<td>(37,423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Subtotal</td>
<td>4,473,093</td>
<td>4,504,039</td>
<td>4,537,438</td>
<td>33,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Subtotal</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>(43,533)</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>1,003,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>1,081,155</td>
<td>1,081,155</td>
<td>1,081,155</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 28,030,964</td>
<td>$ 28,030,964</td>
<td>$ 29,520,124</td>
<td>$ 1,889,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY2022 Town Budget- Recommendation

• Meets FY22 Finance Committee Guideline, which is +3.32% increase over FY21, +$931,231

• FY22 Guideline results in an estimated 2.50% property tax increase
• **Not able to fund all requests:** $346k not funded
• **Reduction:** Capital Outlay (cash portion), approx. $300k, transferred to operating
• **Additional Revenue:** non-property tax revenue to support services, $330k
  – Parking meter receipts = $245k
  – Fees from other entities = $85k (other towns, RHSO, Retirement System; previously booked outside of General Fund budget; auditor recommendation)

• **FY21 Carry Forward:** special legislation allowed FY20 carry forward after close of FY but before Free Cash Certification; existing law (MGL Ch.44, 33(b) allows transfer before close of FY
  – Anticipate remaining balance due to position vacancies & building closures/ remote work
  – Does impact Free Cash, but reduces impact to property tax
FY2022 Town Budget- Recommendation includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guideline Increase</td>
<td>$ 931,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Capital, transfer to Operating</td>
<td>$ 281,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Non-Property Tax Revenue to support services</td>
<td>$ 330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,543,085</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Increase</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1- Covid</td>
<td>$ 370,039</td>
<td>$ 370,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2- Cyber Security</td>
<td>$ 154,113</td>
<td>$ 74,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3- Planned Service Level Increase</td>
<td>$ 230,274</td>
<td>$ 230,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4- New Requests</td>
<td>$ 258,995</td>
<td>$ 168,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5- Contractual, Fixed or Mandatory</td>
<td>$ 875,741</td>
<td>$ 700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,889,162</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,543,085</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY2022 Town Budget- Recommendation includes:

• **Category 1:** Covid-19 Related Expenses, +$191,598

• **Facilities:** additional cleaning required; supplement staff, OT & cleaning supplies, approx. $70k

• **Parking Meter/ Commuter Parking Lots:** approximately $120k in expense not covered by revenue means General Fund will have to cover contractually-obligated to meter maintenance expense
FY2022 Town Budget- Recommendation includes:

- **Category 2**: Cyber Security, +$77,057
- Office 365 license
- Cyber security audit & deployment of recommendations
- Hardware to improvement network security
- Increase store of replacement parts & equipment
- Total cost is $242,500, offset by remaining CARES Act plus existing encumbrances
FY2022 Town Budget - Recommendation includes:

• **Category 3**: Planned Service Level Increases, +$230,274

• Library expansion: additional FTE (+2) and utility costs; partial year, $173k

• Natural Resources: Conservation Crew & Rangers, $62k
FY2022 Town Budget - Recommendation includes:

• **Category 4: New Requests, +$168,415**
  • Legal: +$80,415 for total of $425k
  • Public Works: PFAS testing, personnel restructuring in Park & Trees, +$30k
  • Senior Services: increased hours for social workers, +$8.5K
  • Miscellaneous: archives & committee management, +$8.5k
FY2022 Town Budget - Recommendation Includes:

- **Category 4: New Requests**
  - Economic Vitality, +$41k
  - Created separate & distinct division within General Government
  - Economic Vitality Director is FT position
  - Additional limited status hours for PT staff dedicated to seasonal tourism
  - Matching fund for anticipated grant
FY2022 Town Budget- Recommendation Includes:

- **Category 5**: Contractual, Fixed or Mandatory, +$700,000

- Salary Reserve, adjustments for:
  - Union personnel, in accordance with existing CBA’s; +$550k
  - Non-union personnel, not yet set; +$200k

- Adjustments anticipated to be similar to FY21 and in line with comparable communities; lower than pre-pandemic adjustments
Unfilled Requests

- PT clerk in Human Resources
- Additional consultant funding for Resource Sustainability
- FT plumber in Facilities**
- i-Plan table & monitors, Inspections
- Funding for previously budgeted positions in Finance & Library on-hold

** possible mid-year addition if funded through agreement with Library Corporation
ARTICLE X: Capital Budget

ARTICLE X. Capital Budget

To determine whether the Town will vote to raise and appropriate, or transfer from available funds, or authorize the Town Treasurer with the approval of the Select Board to borrow by the issuance of bonds or notes under the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws c.44 S7, the sum of $5,100,000 as specified in the FY22 Debt Plan, or any other sum, said funds to be expended under the direction of the Town Manager, and further that any premium received by the Town upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by the vote, less any such premium, applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws c.44 S20, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount; or take any other action thereto.
### Capital Budget ‘buckets’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outlay/‘Cash’ Capital</th>
<th>Debt Authorizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Projection:</td>
<td>Requested:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.1M</td>
<td>$11,310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(As discussed during 2/27 Preview Mtg.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended Amount:</td>
<td>Recommended:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$8,415,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A decrease of appx. 25%)</td>
<td>$5.1M in New Debt of $6M avail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $900K in School Capital
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY2021 Requested</th>
<th>FY2021 Recommended</th>
<th>FY22-26 5-yr total req.</th>
<th>FY2022 Requested</th>
<th>FY2022 Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town-wide Technology Fund</td>
<td>1,860,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Improvements – Town-wide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>870,287</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson - Courts Resurfacing</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideout - Bathroom &amp; Building Repairs</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities - Small Equipment</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities - Vehicle/Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Sustainability Fund</td>
<td>1,555,000</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town EV Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Bylaw Recodification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Rules &amp; Regulations Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle replacement for DPLM</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond &amp; stream management</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Computer Equipment</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>FY21 Requested</td>
<td>FY21 Recommended</td>
<td>FY22-26 5-yr total</td>
<td>FY22 Requested</td>
<td>FY22 Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Vehicles</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Equipment</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletproof Vest Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/Modem Upgrades</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Equipment</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Vehicles</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout gear replacement</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBA Cylinder Replacement</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hose Replacement</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Equipment Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Community AED’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathing Air Compressor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Alarm Receiving Equipment</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>127,363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>FY2021</td>
<td>FY2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC WORKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS System</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Infrastructure</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES Permit Compliance</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control Devices</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Sign replacement</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrail Replacement</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Equipment</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Dispenser</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Shade Trees</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turf Improv./ Park Rehab.</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Equipment</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>66,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culvert Improvement</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks - Maintenance</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and Heavy Equipment</td>
<td>415,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debt Plan – 8,415,000

New Debt: $5,100,000
CPA Funds: $ 795,000
Prior Debt Auths.: $1,290,000
Prior Cash Auths.: $ 800,000
Grants: $ 125,000
Other: $ 605,000
### FY 22-26 Capital Program

#### Debt Authorization Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year of Planned System Debt Issuance</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 22-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund - Financing within Levy Limit</strong></td>
<td>$5,250,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>$5,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 22-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.A Revocation/Construction/Acquisition of Town Buildings</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B Municipal Buildings, Town House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>1,395,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,755,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.C Municipal Buildings, 141 Kayser Road</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.D Municipal Buildings, Harvey Wheeler</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,490,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.E Municipal Buildings, Replcy</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>4,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.F Land acquisition for municipal purposes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.G Park Improvements, Emerson Playground (F.D)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>1,419,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,634,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.H Park Improvements, General</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.I Park Improvements, Emerson Field (CPF)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>810,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.J Park Improvements, Purrs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.K Park Improvements, Orchard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.L Park Improvements, Warner Pond dredging</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.M Park Improvements, White Pond</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Source

- D.C. ERP System (Funded from previous Special Town Meeting) | 600,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600,000 |

#### Running and Capital Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 22-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.A Land Acquisition for open space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.B Land Acquisition for Keyes Road Facility &amp; Wireless Tower</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.C Substation Rules &amp; Regulations Update</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.D Invasive Species Plan &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.E Chamberlain Park, bridge over the Black Brook</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.F Ralph Waldo Emerson Historical Home/Museum</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.G Pedestrian Bridge Over Assabet River in W. Concord</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY22-26 Capital Program
### DEBT AUTHORIZATION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year of Planned Long-term Debt Issuance</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2023</th>
<th>FY2024</th>
<th>FY2025</th>
<th>FY2026</th>
<th>FY22-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Engine #3 (2010) &amp; Engine #5 (1990) to be replaced w/ one truck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Engine #4 Replacement (2010) Pumper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Engine #5 Replacement (2017) Pumper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Engine #6 Replacement (1996) Brush Truck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Engine #7 Replacement (2006) Brush &amp; Utility Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Engine #8 Replacement (2010) (Emergency ES)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ambulance #1 Replacement (2000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ambulance #2 Replacement (2011)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Ladder #1 Replacement (2012)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Fire Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Road and Parking lot Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>9,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Drainage, Culverts, Road Reconstruction, Sidewalk Maintenance</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sidewalk Extensions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. TIF Forestry Bucket Truck, G-50 Replacement</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 15 West Street 100#er w/ #5 Replacement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Total Projects</strong></td>
<td>2,854,000</td>
<td>11,790,000</td>
<td>11,874,000</td>
<td>0,775,000</td>
<td>0,680,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,440,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FY22 Capital Improvement Plan, Debt

#### FY22 Debt Program

#### DEBT AUTHORIZATION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund - Financing within Levy Limit</th>
<th>New Debt</th>
<th>CPA</th>
<th>Prior Debt Authorization</th>
<th>Prior Cash Authorizations (reimbursements)</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovation/Construction/Acquisition of Town Buildings</td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>1,236,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings, 111 Kennedy Road</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings, Harvey Wheelers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvements, Emerson Playground (Pool)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park improvements, White Horse</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRP System (Funded ATM 17)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain Park Bridge over the Mill Brook</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge View Education, Hudson Gorge Museum</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvements, Water &amp; Pond dredging</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>2,950,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder #1 Rehabilitation (2012)</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Self Contained Breathing Apparatus</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and Parking Lot Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage, Culverts, Road Reconstruction, Sidewalks</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Forestry Bucket Truck, Replacement</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Wheel Street Sweeper, H-45 Replacement</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Town Projects</strong></td>
<td>5,100,000</td>
<td>796,000</td>
<td>1,296,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>8,715,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - School Projects allocation</strong></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund Total</strong></td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>1,236,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>9,615,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt supported within levy limit
## Renovation/Construction of Town Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Building Systems Costs</th>
<th>Mechanical/ Electrical/Plumbing Systems Costs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>CMLP Repair</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>$363,077</td>
<td>$452,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2a</td>
<td>DPW Repair/133 Keyes</td>
<td>$583,000</td>
<td>$587,876</td>
<td>$1,170,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2b</td>
<td>DPW Repair/133½ Keyes</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>$273,275</td>
<td>$688,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2c</td>
<td>DPW Repair/144 Keyes</td>
<td>$354,000</td>
<td>$65,933</td>
<td>$419,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>Visitors’ Center Repair</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$19,545</td>
<td>$21,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>Town House Repair</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$365,053</td>
<td>$638,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>Assessor’s Building Repair</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$13,569</td>
<td>$28,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-6</td>
<td>Hunn Gym Repair</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$268,755</td>
<td>$306,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-7</td>
<td>Public Safety Building Repair</td>
<td>$1,346,000</td>
<td>$816,707</td>
<td>$2,162,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-8</td>
<td>Everett Street Repair</td>
<td>$173,000</td>
<td>not assessed</td>
<td>$173,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-9</td>
<td>Beehe Repair</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td>$356,218</td>
<td>$455,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10</td>
<td>West Concord Fire Substation Repair</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$213</td>
<td>$68,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-11</td>
<td>Knox Trail Repair</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$45,040</td>
<td>$177,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-12</td>
<td>Harvey Wheeler Repair</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$257,711</td>
<td>$373,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-13</td>
<td>Church Street Repair</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$163,789</td>
<td>$221,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-14</td>
<td>Rigley School Repair</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$3,780,000 $3,616,461 $7,396,461
Electrification of HVAC
141 Keyes Rd.

✓ Inefficient & Unreliable
✓ Total Project Cost
  $440,000
  ✓ $10,000 CMLP Rebate
  ✓ Annual Savings
    - $570.00 year
    - 372 MMBtu or 1.9% of total municipal energy consumption
Harvey Wheeler ADA Access & Emergency Egress Repairs
Emerson Pool & General Parks

Emerson Pool

- Built in Early 1980’s
- Gunite Crumpling & Cracking
- Not ADA Accessible
- Leaks Becoming Worse

Recreation has spent ~$75K for repairs & upgrades since 2017. Pool is over useful life.
Entranceway Perspective & ADA Parking Area
WARNER’S POND DREDGING

Dredging Project Timeline

- February 2011: Watershed Management Plan
- May 2012: Watershed Plan Revised
- August 2018: Dredging Feasibility Study
- April 2019: State Environmental Affairs Ofc. permits “WP Restoration Project”
- Summer 2021: Dredging Project Bidding
- Spring 2020: Dredging Project Commences

(Potentially sooner depending on bids & permitting processes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>source total</th>
<th>project total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlin Park Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encumbrance</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Trust Fund</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Playground, including pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encumbrance</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$1,414,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,524,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,524,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pond, excluding slope restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encumbrance</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,915,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$1,365,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Specific Project Funding - Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY’s</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>source total</th>
<th>project total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emerson Field</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encumbrance</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$62,600</td>
<td>$62,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other gifts</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$15,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georg Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encumbrance</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rideout Playground</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encumbrance</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>FY23</td>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>FY25</td>
<td>FY26</td>
<td>source total</td>
<td>project total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner's Pond, including feasibility &amp; permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encumbrance</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 1,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 825,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,575,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over Assabet River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encumbrance</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debt</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 375,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,375,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Town appreciates your affirmative action on Article 7. Thank you.
From: Richard Landers <rlanders@concordma.gov>
Date: February 24, 2021 at 8:17:37 AM EST
To: Susan Bates <sbates@concordma.gov>, Matthew Johnson <mjohnson@concordma.gov>, Linda Escobedo <lescobedo@concordma.gov>, Terri Ackerman <tackerman@concordma.gov>, Jane Hotchkiss <jhotchkiss@concordma.gov>
Subject: Concord Dispatch Follow-up

Dear Members of the Select Board:

This is just a note in follow-up to the document you received last Monday afternoon addressing key issues and inaccuracies with the Feasibility Study on regionalizing Acton and Concord dispatch operations. I hope you have had a chance to review the material and better understand how the matters involved reach far beyond the mere relocation of a 911 call center.

As the supervisor of Concord Public Safety Communications, I can speak for all Concord Dispatchers when I say that it is an honor and privilege to serve the Town of Concord as its “first first-responders.” The current talk of outsourcing is heart-breaking for us, a number of whom have proudly served this community for more than a decade and also received Life-Saving Awards.

I am at your disposal to provide any further information and insight you may require. My cell phone # is 978-727-6133.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Rich Landers

LEAD DISP Richard Landers, KB1JTX
Training Coordinator, MPTC 1st Responder/CPR Instructor

Concord Public Safety Communications
219 Walden Street
Concord, MA 01742
(T) 978-318-3428 / (F) 978-369-8420
rlanders@concordma.gov
Good Afternoon-

I hope this email finds you well. I sent the following back at the end of October to Ms. Ramussen and Mr. Fahlander for their consideration. I am now forwarding along to you:

Concord Park is concerned for the safety of our residents when they walk through Junction Park to get to the pharmacy or a store because of individuals on bicycles and skateboards that are not adhering to the rules of walking through this area with their bike or board next to them. They are riding and skating through instead.

About a year ago, I reached out to the Chief of Police regarding this subject because one of my residents had reported that while walking through Junction Park on their way to 7-11, they were almost struck by a person riding their bike. Not too long ago another one of my residents who uses a cane to ambulate reported they were almost knocked over by a kid on their bike.

My residents have been very lucky thus far that they have not been hit and fallen, but you can appreciate that this is my fear. I would greatly appreciate it if you could please address this. Thank you so much!

Wishing you and yours a very Happy and Safe Thanksgiving!

-Natasha

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks so much!

-Natasha

---

Natasha Heimrath
Executive Director
P: 978-369-4728
F: 978-369-5381
E: nheimrath@slr-usa.com
www.seniorlivingresidences.com
Good Morning Linda and Stephen,

I am writing in response to a conversation with Dorrie Kehoe regarding the consideration of options for assuring Junction Park remains pedestrian as well as bike friendly, as the Rail Trail development proceeds. Concord Children’s Center in West Concord often takes walking field trips into the West Concord Village area. Our pedestrians are most likely some of the smallest using the Village as a resource. I would like to advocate for advance thinking on strategies for continuing the tradition of making the village and particularly Junction Park an inclusive and welcoming place for all. We would be happy to participate in conversations with other users.

Thanks you for your time and attention.

Pat Nelson

Pat Nelson, Executive Director
Concord Children’s Center
executive@concordchildrenscenter.org
978-369-3747
Cell 978-821-8438
December 30, 2020
Dear Town Manager and Members of the Select Board:

The members of the Board of the West Concord Green Thumbs (WCGT) are writing to each of you to express our concern about safety issues at Junction Park in West Concord. As you know, WCGT is a volunteer group that for years has worked cooperatively with Concord Public Works to renovate, plan, and maintain Junction Park as well as other public parks in West Concord.

In December, several of us attended the meeting of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Advisory Committee (BFRTC) and urged that group to work toward solving the growing issue of bikes and "wheeled vehicles" riding instead of walking vehicles through Junction Park. We understand that a letter from the BFRTC will be forthcoming. Because members of WCGT are on site almost daily throughout three seasons, we have noticed a large increase in usage of Junction Park by residents and visitors, walking and riding. We also know that traffic in the park will increase when the Route 2 bicycle bridge is completed. We welcome all the visitors to the West Concord Village, and are happy to have the Village so widely used. However, we strongly feel that safety issues need to be addressed prior to the completion of the Route 2 Bridge.

Residents and visitors of all ages use Junction Park for a place to gather, sit and chat, pass through, and teach groups of children of all ages. This space deserves your attention. This is not an issue that can wait for action; nor is it an issue that can likely be solved by Concord alone. Rather it will require working with the Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, which oversees the entire BFRTC system. The Board of the WCGT is writing to you, and the members of the BFRTC as we hope and expect you will act to find a solution or solutions for the safety concerns at Junction Park.

We look forward to our continued partnership and work together to keep our West Concord Village beautiful and safe to be enjoyed by all.

Sincerely,

West Concord Green Thumbs Board

Patricia Kent, Ellen Quackenbush, Renee Senes, Tanya Hellman, Cosette Dunn
Dear Town Manager and Select Board Chair Escobedo,

The West Concord Advisory Committee (WCAC) would like to express deep support for both Junction Park and the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. These outdoor spaces contribute to the vibrancy of our village center, and to the quality of life in West Concord and beyond. The committee has been delighted to see increased use of both Junction Park and the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail – a testament to the fact that these spaces are great additions to our community and valued by so many.

Given the heavy and growing use of both spaces, however, we have concerns about safety in Junction Park. Recently completed segments of the BFRT have brought increased use of the trail, along with an increase in the number of people looking for an inviting place like Junction Park to sit and rest for a bit. We expect that completion of the Route 2 bridge will bring yet more use to both of these amenities.

Bicyclists, skateboarders and scooter riders often move quickly through Junction Park, believing they are on a segment of the rail trail – and we share the concerns raised by other organizations and community members about potential conflicts between those on “wheels,” and those enjoying the park, who may not be on the lookout for passersby approaching at relatively high speeds. This is of particular concern given use of the park by many elderly residents and small children – and the poor sight lines as you round the corner of the trail into Junction Park, heading toward Main Street.

We respectfully ask that the Town consider this issue in two ways:

1) A close, immediate look at whether additional safety measures are needed in advance of this spring, when we expect use of both spaces will be high.

2) Longer-term modifications and safety measures that might benefit users of both the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail and Junction Park. We suggest monitoring the effectiveness of initial safety measures this spring and considering additional adjustments if initial measures aren’t effective. We suggest a data-driven approach to understand how the spaces are used, and a risk assessment to identify potential safety issues in anticipation of (and following completion of) additional BFRT segments.

We are happy to be involved in future conversation about potential improvements. We thank you for your time, and for your continued help in making West Concord a great place to be.

Sincerely,

Amy Kaiser, WCAC chair

on behalf of The West Concord Advisory Committee
February 4, 2021

Steven Crane,
Town Manager
P.O. Box 535
Concord, MA 01742

cc: Concord Select Board

Dear Mr. Crane,

At the December 3, 2020 meeting of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Advisory Committee several residents expressed concern about pedestrian safety in Junction Park in West Concord. The issue was brought to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (BFRT) Advisory Committee because the trail passes through the park and it was reported that some trail users are not following posted instructions to dismount and walk their bikes. Two small signs direct bicyclists to “Walk Your Bike” through the park, but this guidance is not always followed. Given the concerns raised and the charge of our Committee, we are advising you of the issue.

Junction Park serves as a pedestrian hub for West Concord: it sits between the Commuter Rail station, the West Concord shopping plaza, and Main Street. Many residents of Concord Park Senior Living use the Park every day and they are particularly vulnerable to injury if a person riding a bike or skateboard should collide with them, a particular concern raised at the meeting. Without a doubt, usage of Junction Park will increase as West Concord continues to grow and the BFRT bridge over Route 2 is completed within the next year.

We understand and acknowledge that significant planning and work by the Town went into the development of Junction Park and the redesign of the Main Street intersection. We also recognize that the concerns raised to date are primarily anecdotal and we suggest more data be gathered about usage of the park to inform the discussion and help the community to shape an approach.

We urge the town to consider three steps:

- Implement near-term remediation (e.g. improved and expanded signage)
- Conduct a study or audit of park usage (i.e., who is using the park, how it is being used and how often there are conflicts)
- Identify and appoint an ad hoc task force to develop options for a practical, long-term solution (e.g. re-routing of the BFRT in West Concord or redesigning Junction Park to provide greater separation of uses).

The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Advisory Committee stands ready to provide input and advice.

The Committee thanks you in advance for your consideration, leadership, and assistance.

Regards,

(signed)
Richard Fahlander, Nathaniel Welch - co-Chairs
Adrienne Boardman, Carol Steele, Dorcas Miller - Members
Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Advisory Committee

Approved by roll call vote February 4, 2021
February 1, 2021

To Whom it May Concern,

We are writing at the request of the West Concord Green Thumbs to lend our voice to clarifying and enforcing the rule for cyclists to walk their bikes along the cobbled section of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail as it passes through Junction Park in West Concord.

As members of a cultural district committee charged with advancing the interests of local businesses and cultural amenities, we take safety and walkability seriously and strive to foster an environment that is inclusive for all. Our worry, as has been stated by others, is that cyclists who do not disembark from their bikes along that small stretch put walkers, elders and others at risk.

We would like to encourage the town to find a way – through signage and increased enforcement – to mandate that cyclists walk their bikes through the park.

In addition, as stewards of the district’s aesthetic and deeply invested in the branding of West Concord Village, we would respectfully request that the West Concord Junction Cultural District Committee be included in any design discussions about signage in the park related to a new enforcement campaign.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Carlene Hempel,
on behalf of members of the West Concord Junction Cultural District Committee (Lisa Evans, Margot Kimball, Jennifer Montbach, Ann Sussman and Kate Yoder)
Dear Linda and other members of the Concord Select Board,

Your meeting tomorrow, March 15th, at 4 pm, contains an agenda item titled: "Nashoba Regional Greenways Project."

1) Would you please post any initial letter or relevant communication from this group in the meeting packet so the public knows what it is about?

2) Would you please allow public comment during the discussion of this item?

Upon some preliminary research, this item seems to be closely related to groups targeting former "rail trails" in communities to turn them into paved bike paths, regardless of what these trails may be now for the community involved.

As you know the Reformatory Branch Trail has been one recent such target. Parties in collaboration with other towns from within Concord have approached you, the Select Board, with misinformation in order to facilitate the goal of resurfacing the Reformatory Branch Trail. (For example, Bedford has not secured funding to pave to the Concord line. More likely they are waiting for us to discuss the RBT so they can then attempt to secure funding.)

As I mentioned during the last meeting of the TAC (and four Select Board members were present at that meeting,) if outside groups would like Concord or other towns to provide paved bike paths, they should be asking the towns (Concord) to suggest options and NOT come and target existing multi-use trails that people of all interests have already been using.

Please post the initial communication on this item and allow public comment during the discussion.

Also, please post this letter per your earlier posting guidelines.

Thank you,

Tanya B. Gailus
To: Members of the Select Board and Concord Middle School Building Committee  
From: Louis Salemy  
Subject: CM at Risk

My name is Louis Salemy—I am a Concord resident and served on both the regional school committee (Chair for two years) and the CCHS building committee. While I was on the CCHS building committee, I served as Vice Chair, and along with Stan Durlacher, Chair, was heavily involved in managing the CCHS project. For three years, I put in 25 hours per week managing the project during the construction drawing phase and the actual construction phase. Overseeing the CCHS project was one of the most rewarding experiences in my life and I take grade pride in the building. To be clear, the success of the project was the result of the entire CCHS building committee, and the towns of Concord and Carlisle were fortunate to have many talented residents on the Committee with backgrounds in construction, architecture, sustainability, and finance.

As you are probably well aware, the CCHS building project got off to a terrible start and made a number of mistakes early on. The biggest mistake that was made was a disregard for the construction expertise on both the committee and the project team. Early on the project, the architects drove the project and cost considerations were essentially ignored. While the entire building committee accepted responsibility when the MSBA funding was suspended, many of us were unaware as to what was happening behind the scenes. When funding was suspended, a number of changes were made to restore balance within the project team, and for the first time, the construction/cost experts within the project team and the building committee were given equal say. The cost issues with the building design were quickly addressed and the project moved forward. Despite the setback, the project finished on-time, under budget, and a number of new design elements were added with the unused contingency. **The success of any project requires creative tension between the architects and the construction experts.** If either entity has complete control, the project suffers.

I have been following the Concord Middle School Project from afar and have been able to do so because of the great communications effort that the Committee has adopted. All presentations are quickly posted to the website and video recordings are made available. While it was not my intention to get involved with this project, the project appears to be making some of the mistakes that the CCHS project made early on. **It is surprising to me that the lessons learned from the CCHS project are not being followed and this is the main reason for this letter being written.** I want the project to be a huge success and this is why I have chosen to speak up.

It is my view that the middle school project is being dominated by the architects and the Owners Project Manager (OPM) has been sidelined. This is exactly what happened on the CCHS project and was the main reason for the initial cost issues. There are two reasons for this concern:

1. The strong bias to not go CM at Risk in the construction delivery method.
2. A high proposed cost/sq ft that has not been challenged.
While the CCHS project made a number of early mistakes, the best decision that it made was going CM at Risk, and Turner Construction, the CM, saved the project $20mm+ through their efforts. Without Turner, the CCHS project would still be a big hole in the ground. The CM at Risk process identified the cost issues with the design early on in the process well before any construction commenced. Given the architect-focus of the middle school project and the lack of other informed opinions, not adopting CM at Risk could result in significant cost issues and may threaten the project from being completed. Unlike the CCHS building project, the Select Board has direct control over the project, and this is my reason for reaching out. Going CM at Risk will greatly reduce the Town's financial risk and also ensure a successful project.

There are two delivery methods for managing a construction project: CM at Risk and Design/Buy/Build (DBB). In all of the timelines issued by the middle school project and recent discussions, it appears that a decision has already been made to go DBB. The only reason that I can come up with this decision is that the accounting for CM at Risk causes an up-front cost to be recognized. The middle school project is trying to keep the project at $100mm, and adopting CM at Risk from an accounting perspective will add another cost hurdle to keep the project within this budget. This makes zero sense-CM at Risk reduces the cost of the project considerably, and not pursuing it greatly adds to its financial risk.

CM at Risk

The largest benefit of going CM at Risk is that the construction manager is involved early on in the project. Once the project is approved at Town Meeting, a CM is hired, and they quickly become involved in the cost estimation of the architect’s drawings. With both design development and construction drawings (CD), the CM uses their cost estimation department to review the drawings and provide accurate cost estimates for each construction trade. With cost data on each sub trade readily available through both their real time market information and a vast network of subs, their cost data is highly reliable. Any cost issues that arise early on can be quickly addressed and value engineering (VE) can be applied to offset any cost issues that arise. Having a CM involved brings a high degree of risk control to the project and an independent cost estimator to ensure the project is on budget. The other huge positive that a CM brings to the table is early construction planning and the proper phasing/coordination of the project.

With CM at Risk, the CM solicits bids from all of the various trades, finalizes a contract with each, and all of the bids are bundled together into a GMP (guaranteed maximum price). The GMP is a contract between the CM and the Town that fixes the cost of the project up-front. Risk is dramatically reduced and transferred to the CM from the Town.

With CM at Risk, the CM is not obligated to take the lowest bid in many of the sub trades. In many instances, the lowest bid may not be the most cost effective. Quality issues and ensuring the work is done per the design can eat up potential cost savings. Additionally, the CM has relationships with many subs, and the working relationship is critical in a well-managed project. One of the big risks the middle school project faces is that the project will be going out to bid right when the greater Boston construction market will be back in full force and very tight. The CM has long established relationships with their subs and can bring these relationships to get these subs to bid on a project in a tight construction market. The risk of
going DBB is that few if any subs will show up to bid and if they do bid, the bids will be well above market.

What I learned from the CCHS project is receiving a cost estimate from a sub for a particular trade is not the same thing as an actual bid. There were several trades during the bidding process where the same subs who submitted cost estimates along the design development and construction drawings process came in materially higher when it came time to actually make a binding bid. These cost issues were identified prior to construction commencing and cost savings were identified in other areas of the project. Had the project gone Design/Buy/Build, it would have been very hard to offset these cost overruns.

To summarize, Construction Manager at Risk is awarded early and assists the town and architect with logistics, designing to the budget, and identifying where contingency should be held. Guaranteed Maximum Price is established as the drawings are being finalized. The process is open book and gives the CM some flexibility in choosing subs. The CM manages the entire bidding process. The CMs costs (staff, office, misc) are negotiated at GMP and then fixed (lump sum). If there is an overrun in staff costs, the CM is responsible for this. Contingencies are managed throughout the project based on remaining risks. During the CCHS project, costs were effectively managed, and contingency was freed up to add additional features back into the project.

DBB

**The architect community is biased against CM at Risk because it forces tough decisions about preferred design elements to be made early on in the project.** Architects always hold out hope that when the sub bids come in, these will be at budget or lower so that preferred design elements can be preserved. With DBB, the tough decisions can be deferred, and there may not be sufficient time for cost savings to be realized in the field should bids come in higher than expected. CM at Risk forces a cost reckoning early on in the project, and cost issues are quickly identified.

With DBB, the Town will still need to hire a general contractor to oversee the construction of the project. However, they are not at risk in any way, and actually make money when change orders are submitted. With design/buy/build (DBB), the Town is obligated to take the lowest price submitted. This is not always the ideal outcome. Quality of work differs dramatically from sub to sub and sometimes, the lowest bid can be the most expensive with the associated issues of low quality work. Managing the subs and the sequencing of work is much easier if there is a good relationship between the subs and the project team. Because of the lack of up-front construction planning, the risk of change orders is significantly higher with DBB.

The Town or the school district will be responsible for managing the bidding process for every trade/component of the building. This is a huge undertaking and either the Town or school administration will need to decide who is going to take this on.
As noted above, the big issue the project will face is that it will be going out to bid in a very tight construction market. There is a high risk that subs are too busy to bid on the project or those that do bid will submit bids that are well above market.

Final Thoughts

I sit on the Concord Library Building Committee and participate in weekly construction meetings with the project team. Jeff Adams is Chair and Elise Woodward oversees the sustainability committee. Both Jeff and Elise were also on the CCHS project and have extensive construction experience. The library project is a $10mm project and yet a decision was made to adopt CM at Risk. Given the experience on this committee, this decision speaks volumes about both the reduction in financial risk and the cost saving potential of CM at Risk.
Preserving the Excellence of Public Safety Communications in Concord

A Preliminary Response to Acton-Concord Regionalization Recommendations by the Edward J. Collins Jr. Center for Public Management

By Lead Dispatcher Richard Landers, Concord Public Safety Communications
Preserving the Excellence of Public Safety Communications in Concord

*A Preliminary Response to Acton-Concord Regionalization Recommendations by the Edward J. Collins Jr. Center for Public Management*

**Introduction**

The Edward J. Collins Jr. Center for Public Management at UMass Boston was authorized by the Massachusetts State 911 Department to perform a feasibility study and produce regionalization recommendations at the request of the Town of Acton which had procured a State grant for the purpose. The other community participating in the study was Concord at the agreement of Town Manager Stephen Crane.

Regionalization initiatives have been promoted for more than a decade by the Massachusetts State 911 Department as a way to reduce costs at the State-level, primarily by reducing the number of 911 PSAPs requiring 911-related equipment and support. In an attempt to incentivize communities to participate in these initiatives, the State 911 Department offers initial start-up grants with the position that creating regional entities inherently is a “greater good” which promises to provide services at scale to communities that imply economies of cost, efficiencies of process and improved/uniform implementation of industry best-practices.

Whether regionalization initiatives actually reduce costs or enhance quality of service for the local participating communities is a secondary matter that does not concern the State 911 Department sponsors of these initiatives. It is in this light that each set of regionalization recommendations must be critically analyzed to determine whether it is of actual benefit to the local communities involved.

Previously in November of 2011, Concord was included in a similar feasibility study by L.R. Kimball at the request of the Town of Sudbury which explored a RECC “solution” for 4-8 communities including Sudbury, Wayland, Weston, Concord, Acton, Maynard, Lincoln and Boxborough. At the time, Sudbury was faced with costs and logistics surrounding the need to create an integrated Communications center combining their own Police and Fire/EMS communications. After completion of the feasibility study, the effort foundered when it became clear that the projected cost savings involved were fictitious, and the Town of Concord had most to lose according to the plan.

This time around, it is instructive to point out that the Town of Acton has solicited a new study grant for several specific reasons as follows:

- Acton has long sought to become a “Host” site for one or more additional communities given the larger build-out of their current communications center square footage. (This is opposed to seeking to participate in an independent Regional District-style RECC).
Acton has an immediate need to replace a current CAD system which is end-of-life with a new system that requires significant capital outlay.

Acton also has an immediate need to replace radio system equipment and infrastructure which requires a significant capital outlay.

One cannot blame the Town of Acton for looking to a Regionalization solution that will both leverage their existing facilities and also cover their looming capital expenditure needs with State 911 grant money. However, the principle of “follow the money” applies here: In the recommendations put forth in the report, Acton benefits far more across the board than does the Town of Concord by the following:

- Retaining the presence of the Communications operation in the Town of Acton.
- Retaining existing personnel under their current scheduling and benefits structure.
- Collecting more financial benefit from the application of grant funding.

Unlike Acton, the Town of Concord does not have any pressing operational, infrastructure or personnel deficiencies that can be best addressed with a regional “solution.”

This document reviews the salient points in the Edward J. Collins Jr. Center final report titled "Feasibility of Establishing A Regional Emergency Communications Center for the Towns of Acton and Concord" (1/25/21) and clearly identifies how this project is not in the best interests of the Town of Concord.

**Response to Feasibility Summary**

Because the Feasibility Study was commissioned by the Town of Acton on its own behalf, it must be kept in mind that all recommendations are directed towards resolving Acton’s issues through a regionalization "solution” that leverages Acton’s existing facilities and infrastructure. This bias permeates the findings. The most proximate partner for this proposed solution is the Town of Concord based on the agreement by Concord Town Manager Stephen Crane to participate in the study.

The study is filled with repeated boilerplate assertions regarding the benefits of regionalization which are unquantified throughout the document including:

- Providing for “more effective” 911 dispatch services.
- Opportunities for dispatcher advancements.
- Standardized dispatch protocols.
- Increased professionalism of operations and increased expectations.
- Enhanced mutual aid.

Additionally, the study claims efficiencies through economy of scale and cost savings that are demonstrably inaccurate. This invalidates the included Cost Benefit Analysis Summary in its current form, although it poses the danger of promoting incorrect suppositions to other decision-makers who need to rely on correct information:

A recent media report in the Concord Journal on 1/15/21 titled "Concord Officials Support Regional Dispatch Plan with Acton" quotes TM Stephen Crane as being in full support of this regional plan along with Police Chief
Joseph O’Connor and Fire Chief Thomas Judge during a recent presentation on the Feasibility Study to the Concord Board of Selectmen. The article further asserts that the total savings between the two towns would be $1.3 million.

The study also recommends either a Hosted or Regional District RECC based in the Acton Public Safety facility which removes Concord Public Safety Communications from its historic location in the Concord Public Safety facility and the Town of Concord altogether. While the study does not actually explore the many issues inherent in choosing either form of governance, there are key issues specifically regarding personnel under either model which can promote a high rate of attrition among current incumbents in the Concord Communications role, thereby threatening the success of early implementation. The study also does not confront the many service and administrative-related issues presented by Concord’s communications function being outsourced to a remote location in a different municipality.

**Forms of Governance**

The study provides two alternatives to governance for the proposed Acton-Concord RECC, both located in the Town of Acton: Hosted and Regional District RECCs. In the **Hosted** model, it is the Town of Acton’s TM and Board of Selectmen that exercise appointing and budgetary authority. Likewise the administrative services for payroll, purchasing, collective bargaining, benefits and retirement are provided through the Town of Acton. This appears to mean that all former Concord Dispatchers would now become employees of the Town of Acton and subject to existing contracts, time-off benefits, work schedules, medical insurance, retirement and pay scales of Acton’s Dispatch CBA with no ability to negotiate better terms if they are significantly less than currently provided by the Town of Concord.

In the **Regional District** model, an independent District Administrative Board including both Town TMs would exercise appointing and budgetary authority and administrative input. All vendor contracts, employee collective bargaining agreements, time-off benefits, work schedules, medical insurance, retirement and pay scales would need to be renegotiated. TM Stephen Crane likes to point out that since both Dispatch work units are currently represented by Teamsters Local 25, it should be easier to ensure that all participants are “kept whole” with regards to their current pay and benefits. This is an assumption without merit, especially since the history of regionalization in Massachusetts involves existing employees being forced to reapply for their current jobs at disadvantageous terms including reduced pay and benefits. It is also a principal reason why experienced and dedicated communications professionals choose to leave rather than join a new entity.

The study makes no mention of the potential costs to Concord Dispatchers under either scenario. It does not examine the possible losses of pay and benefits that would likely be required through forcible transfer into employment status with the Town of Acton under the existing Acton CBA. It also does not examine the costs and difficulty of independent District RECC entities in competitively procuring medical insurance and reconciling the pay and benefits of existing CBAs as different staffs combine. Yet these costs **MUST** be accounted for in any meaningful cost/benefit analysis.
Staffing Analysis and Recommendations

The study recommends a staff size of 1 Director, 1 Supervisor, and 14 Dispatchers. The Supervisor and Dispatchers would be scheduled according to Acton’s current shift plan of 5x2 with fixed days off. This will be unacceptable to Concord Dispatchers who currently are accustomed to working 4x2 schedules with rotating days off. Additionally, 1 Supervisor is inadequate for the task of both working on the other side of the clock on evenings and midnights to “provide oversight, guidance and support” (ostensibly because the Director will be working days) and also assisting the Director with key administrative functions including supervision of training, technology, quality assurance programs and possibly also Accreditation.

Clearly the basic principles of command span of control are missing here. 14 Dispatchers (the first, first responders) working across 3 shifts per day cannot be effectively managed by only 1 Supervisor. If we were speaking of Police Officers or Firefighters, this would be self-evident. The lack of realism involved in this Staffing Analysis requires that it be rejected in favor of a larger one involving multiple Supervisors at minimum if not also an Assistant Director. Also, while the report claims one benefit of regionalization is “opportunities for Dispatcher advancements,” there is no such opportunity if only 1 Supervisor is on staff.

Likewise, the staffing plan calls for flexing between 2 and 4/5 Dispatchers on any/all shifts based on need. It is a non-starter to think that two Towns currently staffed by 2 Dispatchers each on Days/Eves/Midnights could be combined and safely handled with anything less than 3 Dispatchers at a minimum or 3 Dispatchers and a Supervisor on each shift. The fact that both towns have very similar volumes off 911 calls and calls for service bears this out. Failure to adequately address staffing directly affects any accurate cost/benefit analysis and also the safety of first responders and residents of both communities.

A separate issue involves the floor plan design for the Acton space which does not appear to account for adequate COVID-19 spacing and barriers, which is the “new normal” standard and will directly impact accurate costs of facility build-out.

Projected FY23 RECC Budget

The study includes a projected FY23 RECC Budget which is both incomplete and demonstrably inaccurate in its assumptions specifically with regards to Personnel:

- Director Salary $92,500
- Supervisor Salary $72,000
- Dispatcher Salaries (14) $812,000 ($58,000 each)
- Overtime Allowance $45,000

Whether an Executive Director could be recruited at an exempt salary of only $92,500 to work the hours necessary and successfully report to multiple masters remains to be seen. However, it is clear that the report authors made no calculation of the ACTUAL current personnel costs for the Town of Concord:

- Supervisor Salary $74,422
- Dispatcher Salaries (6) $369,489 ($56,160-$66,560)
- Avg. Benefit Cost $65,520 (x$30)
- Avg. Overtime Allowance $98,280 (x$45)
Assumptions here include that there is a planned attrition of 2 Concord Dispatchers prior to a merger due to natural attrition (retirement), that all time-off benefits are fully funded, and that overtime allowance costs are predicated on covering the time-off benefits at an average overtime rate.

The report’s projected Overtime Allowance of $45,000 for a staff of 14 two years from now is 2.25 times less than Concord’s actual overtime expenditure for a staff of 8 in 2020. This alone makes the rest of the numbers included in the report suspect, and certainly renders inaccurate the current cost/benefit conclusions. The report is also unclear about costing “Fringe Benefits,” and does not specify if this refers to medical insurance (which could not possibly be projected at this point) or just paid time-off benefits, which it does not quantify.

The fact that current Concord salaries are significantly higher than what the projected FY23 Budget calls for 2 years from now reveals additional inaccuracies in the cost/benefit assumptions of this study (the current average Concord Dispatcher salary is $60,145). If the projection is based on current Acton numbers, then it confirms that Acton Dispatchers are paid less than Concord Dispatchers and this points back to issues of merging staffs where Concord Dispatchers lose out under the Acton CBA in a Host model. If it is based on the assumption that any new CBAs will be developed at a far lower pay and benefit rate under a District model, then clearly it is not safe to assume that many if any Concord Dispatchers will be willing to make the transition to the new enterprise. It also clearly calls into question TM Crane’s assurances that all Dispatchers will be “kept whole.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Pay Rates</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concord Dispatchers</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>30.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton Dispatchers</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>27.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord Supervisor</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>32.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton Supervisor</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>35.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among hidden costs not even explored in this report should be the human cost of dedicated, experienced and skilled public safety Dispatch professionals who have dedicated themselves to the Concord community for years and are now faced with being forcibly exiled from being Town employees. Any regional enterprise can only hope to succeed (especially in the starting phase) if current employees who are the subject matter experts in their community are willing to transfer to the new entity and contribute their experience and knowledge to ensure success. Otherwise, local knowledge including geography, bylaws, community culture, inter-relationships with Police, Fire and other Town Departments etc. along with exceptional service is in danger of being lost.

Paying More and Getting Less

The study clearly demonstrates how Concord pays more and gets less in return from this regionalizing proposal. In the current Cost Benefit Analysis summary, it indicates that Acton will benefit from non-recurring Capital Savings of $407,466 vs. $179,667 for Concord which is a 44% difference in Acton’s favor due to their
infrastructure needs. At the same time, both communities would need to pay into the new entity roughly equal amounts based on closely matched 911 call volumes and populations, while Concord also loses the presence of its communications operations to an outsourced location in a different municipality. The Recurring Cost Savings alleged in the study are primarily personnel-based and are currently inaccurate.

**Service Impacts: Training**

The study identifies personnel selection and training standards as a key area that regionalization can help improve. **What the report ignores is that Concord already exceeds the State 911 Department’s training standards both for new hires and for continuing education.** Concord already has implemented a comprehensive, multi-year personnel training plan that includes 233 hours of combined, multidisciplinary training in NG911, Law Enforcement and Fire Service Communications, Emergency Medical Dispatch, HazMat Awareness, Pipeline Emergencies (both Awareness and Operations), Domestic Violence, Suicide Intervention, Active Assailant, Hostage Negotiation, Stress Management, Legal Updates & Liability Issues, De-escalation Techniques and Tactical Dispatching. These standards do not require improvement but may very well be impaired under regionalization. Concord also employs industry standard hiring tools which Acton has not currently been using.

**Service Impacts: Community and Responder Safety**

The report ignores information which I directly provided during the study highlighting the uniqueness of Concord as a community with critical infrastructure hazards that to a large degree is not found in the Town of Acton: Apart from a railroad line, high-pressure gas pipeline and state highway that both towns share, Concord has 2 DOC prison facilities, 1 regional hospital including psych and detox facilities, 3 major nursing care facilities, 2 exclusive private boarding schools with international clientele, a civil airfield, multiple rivers, a State DCR park (Walden Pond/Woods), and a National Park which has in the past been a destination for thousands of tourists per year as well as political extremists. On account of this, the Dispatchers in Concord are trained and experienced in Federal/State/Local interoperability and work closely with the State Police and Federal law enforcement resources on a regular basis. This is not a set of skills and experience that will be sustained through being located in a different municipality. Particularly in times of the pandemic and increased concerns regarding local targets for domestic terrorism, it is not the time to be removing the Dispatch function from the Town of Concord.

The report also does not acknowledge the challenges and time required to build from the ground up regarding a new CAD system which Acton requires. Far from Acton merely integrating a new enterprise system and learning how to operate it as an individual community, any such project would require the integration of all data from both communities including Concord Fire run cards and preplans. The Concord Fire Chief has acknowledged that the working relationship between the Concord Fire Department and Concord Fire Alarm is at an all-time best and most professional level, with no daylight between the organizations. Moving Fire Alarm operations out of the Town of Concord and into the hands of those who do not intimately know the Town of Concord is fraught with safety issues, including the question of whether the staffing plan actually provides for minimum Dispatcher coverage per NFPA 1221.
Service Impacts: NEMLEC

The study also makes no reference to the fact that Concord is a member of NEMLEC and provides both a primary response vehicle and trained personnel on regional all-hazards response assignments. It is unclear how this relationship would be affected with Concord Dispatchers removed from their direct membership in the Concord Police Department.

Service Impacts: Ancillary Functions

In keeping with the State-sponsored mission to promote the development of regional 911 services, this study does not examine or consider the value of Public Safety Communications within the local community. Currently the communications staff in Concord is directly available 24x7 and performs many vital functions that are public safety-related without specifically involving 911 services. The study admits that many of these services cannot be transferred to a regional center, but may still be provided locally with additional staff assigned to take up the tasks previously performed by Public Safety Dispatchers. This requires added staffing cost at the local level to maintain our current customer service level. This will also require the use of auto-attendant phone systems, signage and remote video-based call-boxes to drive the public to seek administrative services only during “business hours”.

Likewise, members of the public in crisis and seeking in-person assistance at the darkened station after-hours will be forced to remotely contact someone in a different town to make the initial report and request help. It is not uncommon for walk-ins to report crimes like domestic violence, sexual assault, road rage or have medical emergencies in the Concord police station lobby. This is a loss of direct access and customer service quality that the citizens of Concord currently expect as part of “Exceptional Service All of the Time,” which this regional proposal cannot account for.

Ancillary functions currently provided to members of the Concord Police Department and the citizens of Concord by Concord Public Safety Communications are as follows:

LEAD DISPATCHER

- **DICO**: Dept. Infection Control Officer, policies & procedures including filing & follow-up of unprotected exposure reports
- **EMS Coordinator**: Inventory, service & maintenance of First Responder equipment and AEDs for all personnel, vehicles and police facility
- **MPTC 1st Responder/CPR Instructor**: Staff training in CPR/AED and First Responder for Dispatchers and Officer in-service training
- **Turret Tapes**: Pulling tapes and signing affidavits for recordings requested for court prosecution, investigation, Fire Dept. after-action review and Quality Assurance.
- **CJIS Rep**: Primary CJIS representative for agency. Performs monthly records validations process, Bi-annual Operator certifications for all officers and records division personnel, CJIS and FBI audit cycles.
- **Accreditation Manager**: Assist with LE MPAC and CALEA police agency accreditation process.
ALL DISPATCHERS

Public Window Traffic:
- Taking direct reports of emergencies in progress or just occurred (ex. Domestic violence, assault, missing persons, animal calls)
- Assisting with requests for records & reports
- Handling intake of found property and inquiries regarding lost property
- Handling intake of found animals and inquiries regarding lost animals
- Assisting lost motorists asking for directions
- Assisting with requests for child safety seat installations
- Assisting with requests to use public building facilities
- Assisting with walk-in traffic for C4RJ, DVAAP and AL-ANON
- Supervising and documenting civil custody exchanges
- Supervising and documenting e-commerce-related safe exchanges
- Supervising and assisting with public medication drop-offs
- Assisting with firearms licensing inquiries

Telephone Traffic:
- Handling of Detail requests, cancellations and related documentation
- Handling of public interest calls regarding public events, parking and public transit inquiries, COVID-19 information, Blue-laws, hunting regulations.
- Handling of Poll-related functions including ongoing updates of vote tallies by precinct, security pick-up of ballot boxes and related documentation.
- Departmental point of contact for all personnel calling out sick and related documentation
- Town point of contact for all Animal Control inquiries and requests for service
- Handling of Elder Affairs inquiries
- Handling of School Resource Officer inquiries
- Coordinate tow services for vehicle removal and handle inquiries regarding same
- Handling of public calls regarding weather emergencies, parking at DCR Walden Pond Reservation and overnight bird-tagging operations at US Fish & Wildlife reservation Great Meadows.
- Handling of public calls regarding events and parking at Minuteman National Park.
- Handling of media inquiries during critical incidents.

Support of Other Town Departments:
- Control point for School Transportation Department radio system
- Control point for School Department radio and CCTV system
- After-hours telephone contact for Concord Water Dept.
- After-hours telephone contact for Concord Municipal Light Plant, including power outages and broadband internet service outages, including storm-related tracking of wires/poles down and issuing public notifications regarding major service outages.
- After-hours contact for Concord Highway Dept, including storm-related tracking of trees down and issuing public notifications regarding major roadway closures
After-hours contact for snow-removal related issues from Highway Dept. including vehicles obstructing plowing operations.

**Investigative Functions:**
- Supervising prisoners by CCTV and documenting other activities including feedings and bail release. Assist with walk-in traffic for bail
- Maintain files for Trespass Notices, 209As, Elder Emergency Services Forms
- Maintain files for Council on Aging Lockbox program
- Maintain files for COVID-19 quarantine sites
- Maintain files for Town-wide Emergency Notification Form program
- Assist Officers & Detectives with warrant searches, internet searches, identity imposter investigations, partial plate searches, wireless call traces (other than for 911) MIRCS searches, Trespass Notice searches, 209A confirmations
- 24-hour entry and clearing of records in CJIS/NCIC
- Assist Officers with identifying, documenting and processing donated/found property, weapons and ammunition.

**Public Notifications:**
- Concord CPD Blog
- Code Red Notification System
- CCTV Televue Hypercaster

**Tactical Dispatching:**
- Public Events, Area Searches, Extended Field Operations, EOC Operations, NEMLEC IMT unit participation

**Community Policing initiatives:**
- Public access to 911, Open House, Citizen’s Police Academy, CPR training, COVID-19 vaccination administration (2 EMTs certified)

**Conclusions: What’s In It for Concord?**
Any discussion of regionalization that involves Concord must first begin with the question “What’s in it for us?” This is especially true since the feasibility study was not developed with Concord’s best interests in mind, does not acknowledge the impact of loss of quality services for the citizens of Concord which will be inevitable under the current scheme, does not accurately reflect current Concord personnel or overtime cost, is not realistic in either its staffing recommendations or cost/benefit analysis, and has no specific recommendations for how Concord benefits from this proposal in any meaningful, tangible way. Rather, it assumes that Acton will benefit from Concord’s outsourcing of operations without regard for the consequences to Concord.

From Concord’s perspective, this feasibility study recommends an inferior solution in search of a non-existent problem.

**Operations:** Concord’s communications operation is already integrated, combining Police, Fire/EMS, National Park Service, Mass DOC and DPW/Utility communications. Concord already enjoys comprehensive
interoperability with other jurisdictions Statewide through BAPERN, District 14 and NERAC among others.

- **Personnel:** Concord is already sufficiently staffed with 9 full-time equivalents including a Lead Dispatcher providing supervision of both training and quality assurance. This enables 2 Dispatchers to work from 0000-2400 hrs, with the capability to deliver EMD and divide tasks between call-taking/dispatching and Police/Fire as needed.

- **Training:** Concord’s communications personnel are already trained to a standard beyond the recommendations of the State 911 Department and this study including for all new hires and continuing education.

- **Critical Incident Management:** Concord’s EOC is drilled on a regional basis with other jurisdictions within NERAC, and Dispatchers are trained to operate within the Incident Command System whether remaining inside the communications center or operating in either the EOC or a field Command Post. Concord also is the host to NEMLECs IMT response vehicle and provides staffing for same.

- **Ancillary Services:** Concord’s public safety communications personnel perform many additional functions to 911-related operations and form the primary contact experience the public has with Police, Fire and public utility services (after-hours) 24x7. This is cost-effective, direct, personal, and leverages local knowledge while providing the public with a superior quality of customer service. This area in particular would be sacrificed in any regionalization proposal at increased cost to the Town.

The regionalization proposal would necessarily result in a loss of service excellence for Concord while costing what remains an undetermined amount due to the untrustworthiness of the financials currently provided.
To the Concord Select Board and Selectboard Candidates,

I am pleased to see that you are considering the wider implication of our wonderful Concord bike trails in your March 15th meeting.

As an avid cyclist, I love the many bike trails that have been established west of Boston. However, as an avid environmentalist, I also hope that both the Select Board and the various committees and task forces in town will consider Concord’s unique natural resources in all bike path deliberations.

As an economist, I have often seen “multi-use” and “regional decision-making” arguments used to subjugate very sensitive, and unique stakeholders/abutters. I would hate to see this happen in Concord.

In my humble opinion, the discussion of any change in the surface/width of Reformatory Branch Trail is a case in point. Reformatory Branch passes by Great Meadows Wildlife Refuge, part of an extensive conservation reserve overseen by US Fish and Wildlife and home to many rare species.

Currently, Reformatory Branch in Concord offers access for hikers, dog-walkers, and bikers. I do not see any reason to compromise the health and safety of the wildlife in Great Meadows to some abstract goal of regional bike trail interconnectivity. I strongly encourage the SelectBoard to lead the charge to leaving Reformatory Branch in Concord as is.

Have the various Concord groups/task forces considered alternative routes to connecting Bedford (when it has actually been finished to the town line) to downtown Concord? And, even more importantly, to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail.

I look forward to these Concord town groups considering these wider issues.

Sincerely,

Ellen Quackenbush
206 Prairie St
West Concord
MAPC Technical Assistance Program (TAP) Funding Application
For the Nashoba Regional Greenways (NRG) project

This application for Technical Assistance Program ("TAP") funding is submitted by the Town of Littleton on behalf of the Nashoba Regional Greenways ("NRG") coalition, the municipal alliance recently formed to implement the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)'s Landline Vision in the greater Nashoba River/Assabet valley region.

Lead Municipality and Lead Contact for Submittal: The Town of Littleton is the lead municipality. The primary contact is Anthony Ansaldi, Town Administrator, reachable at aansaldi@littletonma.org. Point-of-contact for technical content of the application is Gary Lacroix, chairperson of Littleton's Transportation Advisory Council. Gary can be reached at gaduzabe@yahoo.com or 978-505-9252 (cell); 978-486-0406 (home).

Project Description and Context: Several years ago, MAPC proposed connecting existing trails and greenways to promote active transportation (e.g., walking and cycling) in the Greater Boston region. MAPC's vision, called Landline, was to create or connect over 1,400 miles of greenways and foot paths in the region that would safely connect existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and make opportunities for active transportation and recreation even more available to residents of the Greater Boston region. See https://www.mapc.org/transportation/landline.

In 2020, residents, staff and elected officials from the towns of Littleton, Ayer and Acton started meeting with MAPC to explore implementation of MAPC’s Landline vision in their area. The three towns and MAPC helped generate interest from neighboring communities. Now, re-branded as the Nashoba Regional Greenways (NRG) coalition, regular meetings are occurring that, in addition to the original three towns, involve representatives from the towns of Bedford, Bolton, Boxborough, Carlisle, Concord, Devens, Harvard, Hudson, Lincoln, Stow, and Sudbury, as well as participation from other important stakeholders including MassBike, the Solomon Foundation, the Montachusett Regional Planning Commission ("MRPC"), MAPC, and MADOT.

Project Need and Alignment with Local, Regional, and State Goals: The NRG region (which roughly corresponds to MAPC's Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination ("MAGIC") sub-region, with the addition of a few towns in the MRPC region) is blessed with many existing major shared-use trails and greenways, notably the Nashua River Rail Trail, the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, the Assabet River Rail Trail, the Mass Central Rail Trail, and the Minuteman Bikeway. Several towns (Ayer and Stow notably) have received sizable MassWorks grants to improve sidewalk and bicycle infrastructure. The Devens community has a new shuttle bus station. The towns of Maynard and Acton have a recent, active bike share program that provides vital connections to the Mass. Bay Transportation Authority commuter rail station in South Acton.

Currently, however, there are no established connections between these resources, and no designated safe or appropriate routes for vulnerable users. For example, a cyclist wishing to travel from the Bruce Freeman Trail in West Concord to the Assabet River Rail Trail would not
necessarily know that there is a safer and more direct route via Laws Brook Road to South Acton, rather than the busy Route 62 to Maynard.

Many of the roads in the region feature relatively low traffic volume compared to other municipalities in the MAPC region, and rights of way sufficiently wide to accommodate recreational users, thus safe and appropriate connections are possible using the existing road network. It is the goal of the project to raise awareness and provide wayfinding materials (e.g., signs and road markings and phone apps to make these connections clearer for users).

The NRG region, therefore, presents a unique, present opportunity to create connections between existing shared-use paths as well as to mass transit and community centers that would be an important step forward for MAPC’s Landline vision. Moreover, the NRG effort represents the kind of regional cooperative effort that MAPC excels at creating and assisting. In addition, the NRG coalition’s efforts will further several of the goals set forth in MAPC’s MetroFuture plan, including but not limited to Sustainable Growth (by promoting the use and preservation of greenways), Transportation Choices (by making active transportation choices more accessible and convenient), Healthy Environment (by reducing carbon emissions), and Regional Prosperity (by improving connections between municipalities and bringing more potential customers to area businesses). The project would also support the provisional goals for MetroCommon by ensuring that bicycle infrastructure is safe, extensive, and high quality. And by filling in gaps in the existing trails network, the NRG coalition’s work also directly furthers Goal 2, Supporting the Statewide Trails Initiative, of the Commonwealth’s Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation (“SCOR”) Plan.

**Project Deliverable(s) and Outcome:**

The *Primary Project Deliverable* is to develop and implement a safe, comfortable, and well-used regional active transportation network in the Nashoba Regional Greenways region. The coalition seeks MAPC’s support in the coming year to (1) help organize and establish a more formal structure for the coalition, (2) support public education and outreach, (3) support community review and input into the Landline map routes, and (4) develop local implementation guidance and a signage plan.

To that end, the first Project Deliverable will be developing and implementing an administrative structure to manage the efforts of the coalition. At the same time, the coalition will reach out to other communities in the MAGIC region and possibly some adjacent communities to offer participation and to grow the coalition. The coalition has already drafted a mission statement and charter, expanded its membership, consolidated information on a Google drive, and meets regularly, but further assistance is needed to take it from an ad-hoc group to a more sustainable and formalized entity. Specific assistance being sought includes assistance with: finalizing the mission statement and charter, developing and maintaining an email distribution list, developing a logo and website, and providing support at coalition meetings (typically bi-monthly) and Executive Committee meetings (at least quarterly).
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The second deliverable will be to promote the project goals and objectives, to develop community support and conduct public education and outreach, particularly to relevant municipal officials (e.g., DPW/Highway superintendents, town administrators/managers, select boards) and eventually the general public. TAP grant assistance would be particularly useful at this stage, to provide sufficient staff time to assist in this effort and to develop outreach messaging and tools.

The third deliverable will be for each community to “ground truth” its portion of the Landline map, suggest changes or additions, identify challenges, and eventually establish a local “to do” list (e.g., signs and pavement markings). MAPC support is requested to develop a process for review, as well as supporting, collecting, and analyzing the feedback to support map updates.

The fourth deliverable will be to establish a signage plan in coordination with MassDOT standards, as well as guidance that local DPWs or Highway departments can use to implement their “to do” list. TAP grant assistance is requested to help develop the signage plan and implementation guidance.

At the end of the project, cyclists, pedestrians, and other non-motorized users will be able to more easily connect with existing shared use and greenways for recreation and exercise, and to access downtowns and other centers of interest, including MBTA facilities and other public transportation infrastructure.

**Community Engagement:** The NRG coalition already benefits from having enthusiastic support from across its region with at least one representative from each member town. These representatives include town planners, local bike/ped advocates, Selectmen, etc. As noted above, one of the NRG coalition’s first steps will be to have these representatives engage with town officials and stakeholders to explain the coalition’s goals and to build support.

Meetings with local officials will emphasize the impact that improved connections with shared use paths and greenways could have on under-resourced communities with no direct access to mass transit, by improving safe opportunities for travel other than by motor vehicle, to connect to public transportation and community centers, as well as to augment opportunities for recreation.

TAP grant assistance would be particularly helpful in facilitating community engagement.

**Project Timeline:** The NRG coalition anticipates the following timeline:

1. **1st half of 2021:**
    1. Implement an organizing structure to the NRG coalition.
2. Reach out to remaining target communities (all those in MAGIC subregion such as Lexington and Maynard plus those in adjacent compatible communities in the MAPC and MRPC regions that would be key links in the NRG network), most likely to a maximum of 20 communities.

3. Develop outreach tools to assist in effective messaging to: a) community leaders; b) target audiences (bike advocates, etc.); c) general public in each community especially for those communities with limited options for non-motorized transportation.

2nd half of 2021:

4. Develop tools and infrastructure for operation and publicizing NRG to include items like mailing lists, logo, website

5. Establish a screening tool and/or checklist to use to validate/ground truth the route in each community and finalize the network within each subregion.

6. (Related to #4) Identify the To Do list for each community as to steps needed to have the network meet Landline goals (i.e., pavement markings, road changes, and in some cases actual construction projects). Funding for these items would be pursued separately.

Future tasks for the NRG coalition (support not requested in this application) are expected to include:

1st half of 2022:

7. Establish a signage plan (after MassDOT finalizes their signage guidance). Specifically identify standards for the different types of signs to be used and a plan for where they should be placed and what they would say. Also look to create a phone app with route information and related resources.

8. Take items 6 & 7 and develop a Tool Kit for local DPWs to implement the network.

2nd half of 2022:

9. Develop educational resources such as ‘share the road’ type information; partnering with like-minded organizations such as MassBike.

10. Take the lessons learned from the NRG initiative and share with other networks of communities.

Municipal Commitment: Letters of support from municipal officials in MAPC communities and within the NRG region will be sent under separate cover. The NRG coalition recognizes the importance of municipal commitment since implementation of infrastructure changes (e.g., signage and pavement markings) will be performed by the municipalities.

Municipal Contribution: Tangible support will be provided through continued support and participation of NRG members in each community and requests for use of meeting spaces and possibly use of town resources for outreach. It is anticipated that additional volunteers from each community will become engaged once the NRG initiative is more widely publicized. It is anticipated that each municipality will be required to devote a number of hours of staff time and resources to signage and pavement marking improvement, and possibly other infrastructure changes. Other than the devotion of staff time (and associated wages), the NRG coalition hopes to fund signage and any other equipment as incidental costs in conjunction with
ongoing municipal maintenance and improvement projects. Targeted grants may also be sought to purchase and place signage and/or for specific construction projects.

Signature
This DLTA TAP Project Concept request is signed by:

Anthony M. Ansaldi, Jr.
Town Administrator
Town of Littleton