

## APPENDIX C

### Capital Projects Not Recommended for Appropriation in FY 2006

The following requested projects were deemed of lower priority and therefore are not recommended for funding within the limit of available funds.

F-1	Replace Fire Engine #4	\$ 75,000
F-2	Fire Dept. Tactical Command Unit	\$ 33,745
F-4	Defibrillator	\$ 23,000
F-5	Emergency Generator	\$125,000
Safety -1	Trunked radio System	\$413,000
P&R 3	Greenwood Center Walk Repairs:	\$ 36,132
DPW-2	Street Signs	\$ 20,000
DPW- 5	Brush Chipper	\$ 40,000
DPW-7	Tractor with Attachments	\$ 45,000
DPW-3	Dump Truck with Plow III	\$115,000
DPW-3	Dump Truck with Plow IV	\$115,000
DPW -14	Tractor with boom mower	\$100,000
DPW-15	Sewer Cleaner	\$250,000
DPW-16	Stump Grinder	\$ 38,000
SD-1	Environmental Remediation	\$ 15,000
SD-12	Enclose portable classroom	\$ 10,500
SD-14	Russell Field Sprinkler System	\$125,000
SD-19	Glenbrook Handicap Elevator	\$200,000
SD-20	LHS Handicap Elevator	\$150,000

1. Project F-1: Fire Department Engine #4: Request \$145,000

Details on this request and the reason for our lower ranking are in the body of this report to the Selectboard. Chief Madison has proposed the replacement of Engine #4 with a non-traditional fire fighting unit. Instead of an in-kind engine replacement, the Chief has requested the purchase of a quick attack pumper with other specialized equipment. This is a lower cost alternative to a full sized fire engine. The committee agrees with Chief Madison that there is a need for this additional apparatus, and the lower cost alternative to a traditional engine is supported. However, we continue to believe that it is important that the town adhere to a schedule of evenly spaced purchases of fire engines.

2. Project F-2: Fire Dept. Tactical Command Unit: Request \$ 33,745

This request to replace the Fire Chief's vehicle with a Tactical Command unit was judged as being of lower criticality and growth than other requests and therefore in the judgment of the committee does not rank above the level that is being recommended for funding in this planning cycle.

4. Project F-4: Defibrillator: Request \$24,000

The current defibrillator was characterized as "working fine" but is based on older technology. The primary reason for the recommended purchase appeared to our committee to be the fact that the ambulance was being replaced and it would be nice to have a new defibrillator in the new ambulance. Money exists in the ambulance fund for a defibrillator, but the Capital Planning Committee did not see this as a priority purchase and therefore rated it below the recommended funding level.

5. Project F-5: Emergency Generator Request \$125,000

This project requests the purchase of an emergency generator and the revisions to the high school electrical system to wire such a system into the school. The definition for this project is still under development, and private funds have been secured to pay for this definition work. The committee sees this project as having low urgency (low probability of actually being needed), but high severity (should the town need it, such a system would be invaluable). Once the project is better defined and the potential cost better determined, the committee will re-evaluate this request.

17. Project F-6: Trunked Radio System Request \$413,000 (\$62,600 in FY07)

The request for a town-wide radio system is well founded in the need for town groups to be able to better communicate. However, the committee also felt that the proposed system was a very expensive solution to this communications issue. A review by the committee of the proposed system found that in order to bring even the first phases of this project "on-line" requires the expenditure of over \$300,000 (the base unit, fire dept. console, police console, and vendor engineering services). This expenditure would not provide any portable units, the primary justification for this item. The requested \$62,600 would do nothing but put money into a capital account that would need to accumulate for five years before the first useful elements of the project could be put into use. The committee rated this project below the funding level based on our ability to impact the actual needs of the departments within the next five years. The expenditure of \$413,000 could pay for 800 years of cell phone service (\$40 / month x 12 months) which means that fifty people in town could get cell phones and it would take 16 years before they spent more than the proposed capital cost of this system. If the Selectboard deems this system of critical value, the town should consider bonding for this item in order to get immediate use from the system.

9. Project P&R 3: Greenwood Center Walkway resurfacing Request \$ 36,132

The committee feels that there are safety aspects of the Greenwood Center upgrades that merit attention, but that these segments of this larger request are better handled as maintenance items rather than as capital requests. The committee does not believe that alternative (lower cost) solutions to resurfacing the parking and walkway areas at Greenwood center have been fully explored and therefore rated this project below the recommended funding level.

19. Project DPW-2 Street sign replacement Request \$60,000 (\$20,000 in FY 07)

This submission requests the funding of the first 1/3 funding that will ultimately replace of all the street name signs in town to be in compliance with a new federal law. The new law requires that street sign names be in 6" high block letter rather than the 4" height of the letters on current signs. The committee rated this need below the funding level in priority because the street signs we have are fully functional. We further believe that this sign replacement can be phased in through normal attrition and replacement of signs. The risk of not changing the height of letters in the street signs quickly (loss of highway funds) appears to be low enough that this committee is recommending that this project not be funded at this time.

22. Project DPW-5 Brush Chipper Request \$40,000

This request was rated below the funding level because outsourcing is available for this activity. The committee noted that improved department efficiency that might be available for activities such as grinding discarded Christmas trees (chip them in place rather than move them to the town yard for contract chipping later).

24. Project DPW-7 Tractor with Attachments Request \$45,000

The committee rating of this request resulted in it being below the funding level. The primary reason for this rating was that these funds are requested to purchase new equipment rather than replace a piece of existing equipment. The increased work efficiency that this equipment would bring still ranked below the need to purchase replacement equipment.

27. Project DPW-3b Plow Truck #3 Request \$115,000

31. Project DPW-3c Plow Truck #4 Request \$115,000

The committee's reasoning for rating the purchase of these two additional plows below the funding level are outlined in the letter to the Selectboard. The committee recognizes the need for a minimum of four fully operational snow plows, but believes it would be imprudent to purchase all four in the same year.

33. Project DPW-14 Tractor with Boom mower Requested \$100,000

The committee's rating of this request reflected the DPW superintendent's prioritization of new equipment needs.

34. Project DPW-15 Sewer Cleaner Requested \$250,000

Although this equipment is critical to the sewer department's needs when a back-up occurs, there are currently alternate resources available for cleaning the sewers. The town needs to better justify paying this price for an infrequently used (no matter how critical it is) piece of equipment. Sharing a sewer cleaner with regional towns seems to be an option that should be pursued since it is unlikely that simultaneous sewer back-ups will occur, and routine sewer cleaning can be scheduled. This equipment would be funded out of the sewer stabilization fund.

35. Project DPW-16 Stump Grinder Requested \$38,000

The committee strongly believes that the town should be grinding the stumps of the tree belt and town land (parks, etc) trees that are cut down. That being said, the alternatives for getting tree stumps ground (contract outsourcing) resulted in this request being ranked below the funding level.

36. Project S-2 Environmental remediation Requested \$16,000

The school department has asked for funds to purchase and locate 40 ft. trailers at the High School to act as a satellite hazardous waste site for electronics, fluorescent bulbs, etc. This request was rated below the funding level because our committee believes that the alternative of a single town-wide hazardous waste collection site is more cost efficient than preparing and operating a separate site for the schools. Even though this was a key item on the high school accreditation requirements, the alternative solution should be explored in conjunction with the DPW.

44. Project S-12 Enclose base of WMS Portable Classroom Requested \$10,500

This request was for funds to place a skunk-proof enclosure around the portable class-room at Williams Middle School. The enclosure will need to be "burrow-proof". The committee rated this request below the funding level because we felt there were "low tech" alternatives to rousting the skunks (such as mothballs) that need to be exhausted.

46. Project S-14 Russell Field Sprinkler and Retrofit Requested \$125,000

The committee continues to recognize the need to maintain the sports fields at the high school. The lack of adequate watering will quickly turn these fields into dustbowls. The harsh reality of our evaluation of this request, however, is that the current sprinkler system, as antiquated and minimally adequate as it may be, still works. This proposed sprinkler system upgrade neither enhances the mission of the school department (thereby giving it a high seriousness) nor does it have a high growth potential (worst case, the fields need re-seeding). As much as we would like to support this request, in the five years that it has come before this committee we have not been able to objectively rate this high enough to get into the "funding level" of projects. The committee suggests that this project might be a candidate for a "citizen's initiative" such as was done to revise the track and bleachers at the football stadium.

50. Project S-19 Glenbrook School Handicap elevator Requested \$200,000 (\$4,500 in FY07)

This project needs to be scoped and a thorough cost estimate written. The requested \$4,500 falls below the threshold for capital funding, and the need is not of sufficient criticality to warrant moving forward with scope / execution in one stage (as is being recommended with painting Center School).

51. Project S-20 High School Handicap elevator Requested \$150,000 (\$3,500 in FY07)

This project needs to be scoped and a thorough cost estimate written. The requested \$4,500 falls below the threshold for capital funding, and the need is not of sufficient criticality to warrant moving forward with scope / execution in one stage (as is being recommended with painting Center school).