

Questions Posed by the Lexington Capital Expenditures Committee (CEC)
Regarding the Proposed Lexington Department of Public Works (DPW) Facility Project
and

Notes (“N”) taken by David G. Kanter, Member, Lexington Appropriation Committee,
of the Discussion at the CEC Meeting, 30 Oct 2006, in the Selectmen’s Meeting Room

DPW Questions

1. Who is the owner of this project and responsible for coordinating all aspects of the project i.e., design, bidding, construction, interim operations?

N: While it’s a DPW project, the Permanent Building Committee (PBC) will have oversight.

2. Shouldn't we reconsider Hartwell Ave?

N: No. It would be the same project, but with the added complication of having to put the structures on pilings to avoid violating the constraints of the less-expensive manner in which the old dump was capped—and there are also constraints with regard to what kinds of activities are allowed with having done that type of capping.

3. What would the cost differential be if we constructed the proposed facility at Hartwell Ave?

N: *See #2 above.*

4. Is it really necessary to relocate some staff from Town Hall? What is the cost of space for the relocated personnel at the new facility? Who will backfill the TOB space?

N: Not necessary, but prudent. The Town Office Building (TOB) is already crowded and those that would be moved to the new DPW facility are consistent with more efficient operations by their offices. The space for them in the new facility is on the order of 3,000–4,000 sq ft. No explicit cost was cited and while exactly what would backfill the space in the TOB wasn’t cited, relief of the current overcrowding implied there were many candidates for using that space.

5. What is the cost of achieving LEEDS "certified" (the lowest level of LEEDS) level? What is the additional cost of achieving LEEDS "Silver" level? To be LEEDS, how much day lighting needs to be installed? Are there any incentives (e.g. grants) for LEEDS certification?

N: The design has been done based on an objective of LEEDS “Silver”—consistent with the policy adopted by the Board of Selectmen—however, the project may not spend the 2–3% of construction cost to obtain the formal certification. No specific costs are known for working toward a LEEDS “Silver” level, nor have any cost/benefit analyses (e.g., design & construction cost versus life-cycle costs of the building and systems) been done to quantify shooting for LEEDS “Silver”—or any other LEEDS level. As for incentives, none are specifically known now for when the project is projected to be started/finished, but whatever are available at that time would be pursued.

6. Why can't you remain in present facility with less expensive upgrades? For example, can we refurbish the office space and maintenance portion of the existing facility, and only reconstruct the vehicle storage?

N: There are significant non-code-compliant situations with the current facility and if 30% or more of the facility needs to be reconstructed—which is seen as clearly the case—then the whole facility must be brought up to current code; therefore, partial reconstruction is not a practical alternative.

With regard to using a pre-engineered structure for the garage, that is being considered, but there are difficulties with such structures meeting all the State codes.

7. What temperature is maintained in present vehicle storage garage?

N: The temperature in the current garage was not cited. *See #20 below regarding what's proposed for the new garage.*

8. What happens if the debt exclusion referendum fails?

N: As the DPW facility has to be upgraded, it's recognized that there would be two fundamental options: Downscale the project or, after providing further information to the citizens on why the full project is essential, re-present the project (with updated costs due to the delay) in another referendum.

9. Why are we requesting construction money at STM before we have the construction documents phase completed? Why are we taking a non-traditional approach to financing rather than appropriating (only) the remaining design funds at STM and then the construction money at ATM? What if the design phase shows the costing to be higher (or lower) than the \$30.5M?

N: Construction costs are increasing at 1–1.5%/month, so beyond the postponed availability of the new facility—with all the advantages that holds for the Town—delay will mean a further, significant, increase in project cost. We're now at the Design Development stage and it's going to take another 6–7 months to get to Construction Documents—and the benefit of a tighter cost estimate. That means we wouldn't have that cost estimate even by the 2007 Annual Town Meeting—which would push any debt-exclusion referendum to, at best, mid-2007 and any bidding/construction award consequentially later, still. By going to a Special Town Meeting (STM) in November using the Design-Development cost estimate (which should be in hand in a week or so and the analyzed result a week or so thereafter), we can get to the referendum much earlier and, if passed, get to bid and award without the cost and productivity impacts of the multi-month—if not also a construction season—delay.

The STM would be presented with a project cost estimate that would include the Design-Development cost estimate which, in turn, will include an estimate for the full cost of getting to Construction Documents. (While the total cost for getting from Design-Development to Construction Documents is likely to be at least twice as high, it's expected that about \$1–1.2M of the total would have been

earned by the time of a referendum at the Annual Town Elections.) If the referendum were to fail, the project costs to date would be covered by Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs).

10. Do we need a full time EOC - things went fairly well in the Keyspan case?

N: It's not planned to have a full-time Emergency Operations Center (EOC). Most of the space is actually an otherwise needed meeting room—with just a small storage area for the communications equipment, etc., that would be brought into use if the EOC were activated. While the Town is proud of how things were handled in the Keyspan incident, there were major disruptions to operations by the ad hoc EOC approach that had to be taken. The Town shouldn't plan the new DPW facility such that a more-appropriate EOC capability isn't included.

11. Why does Wayne Brooks need two offices, as shown on floor plan?

N: He doesn't; the second office is for the Highway Superintendent. (Wayne has had to cover that job, too—in addition to being Manager of Operations—but it's expected that the Highway Superintendent position will be filled soon.)

12. Why is wash facility larger than Bedford's facility?

N: Bedford's wash facility was designed to be an outside unit, but they had to move it into the building in order to comply with conservation requirements. In the process, compromises were made and their's is not what it should be. The wash facility for our DPW project has been designed, instead, to be an optimum, inside, facility.

13. What does each component, i.e. garage, salt storage, office space, fuel facility, etc cost?

N: Once the Design Development cost estimate is in hand, it will be broken down by the major elements (including site-preparation & landscaping). As of now, costs range from \$256/sq ft for the administrative space to \$192/sq ft for other space.

14. Can any of the proposed functions, e.g., some mechanical repairs be out sourced and thus reduce the size of the maintenance facility?

N: Some repairs, etc., are already outsourced and, in analyzing the requirements for the new facility, the possibility of outsourcing was further considered. No additional outsourcing was found to be cost/service effective.

15. Programming indicates some personnel growth over existing levels, is this realistic and when will it happen?

N: No staff growth is expected over the levels provided for in the current design. With regard to possible consolidation of the management of the municipal & school maintenance/construction activities, the current design provides for the organization currently being discussed.

16. What construction project management systems will be in place to identify cost and schedule problems early on?

N: The project scope includes having a Clerk of the Works for 18 months. That person would use the same management tools (software, data-collection, etc.) as the Town has used on previous, large-scale, construction projects.

17. How much of the \$30m is for new equipment? What is the breakdown for building construction, and outfitting? Is it planned to re-use any existing equipment? What existing equipment will be reused in the new facility?

N: Dollar amounts for the industrial equipment will be included in the Design Development cost estimate and what portion of the existing equipment would continue to be used will also be provided in the next cost estimate provided to the Town.

18. How confident are we in the Environmental Impact Statements? Are we sure we're not going to find (e.g.) saturated oil beneath the vehicle storage facility?

N: While some additional sampling is being done within the week, there is high confidence from the data to date that no significant cost or schedule impact need be included due to site conditions.

19. What are the expected operational costs of the facility? How much will it cost to heat and operate it? How does this compare with existing facility costs?

N: The operating costs for the current facility are on the order of \$47,000/year. An estimate is not in hand for the new facility, but even with an energy-efficient design, it's important to be reminded that the new facility has nearly twice the square footage as the current facility.

20. Do we really need a warm building for the trucks? What will be the "set" temperature?

N: Beyond the improved operational & maintenance efficiencies, having a warm building is anticipated to extend the life of the vehicles housed by about 1 year—an estimated \$7M savings over the 50-year life of the facility. The garage, along with the administrative portion of the project, will have energy-recovery provisions applied to exhaust air.

Most of the new garage area is planned to be heated to 50–55° F. (A small maintenance portion may be heated to a higher temperature to facilitate that activity.) None of the garage will be cooled by mechanical air conditioning. It was questioned why something lower, such as 45° F, might not be sufficient for the primary garage area and that will be investigated.

21. Will the building be gas or oil fired?

N: Except for a back-up generator (which will use diesel fuel), the building will have roof-top, gas-fired, equipment.

22. Whose responsibility is it to recycle existing items on the site?

The general contractor will have responsibility to properly recycle materials from the site.

23. Is there a waste oil burning facility on the site?

N: No. For the volumes involved, it's not cost effective to have one.

24. Will any ground water be used by the facility?

N: While none is planned to be drawn off (e.g., by a well), it is planned to use geothermal heat-pump systems for the administrative area.

25. Will a traffic signal be installed, and if so, what is the cost?

N: While the traffic studies do not project any significant change in volume, there may be a recommendation to add a signal—primarily to aid left turns by those leaving the facility. If so, it would be a signal coordinated with the existing signal at the bike path; however, as that's a State road, any final approval would have to come from the State.

26. Where will DPW operate out of during the construction period? Has a transition plan been developed and priced?

N: While construction will be phased, it's currently contemplated that except for the salt & sand operations during the winter, all other DPW operations would be housed in some swing space—which is yet to be determined. (It's being considered to request that the Minuteman Technical Vocation School allow our mechanics to operate out of their facility while our new facility is being constructed.)