

Article 6 Committee

September 27, 2018

MINUTES

Meeting was called to order at 7:06pm

Present: Suzanne Wright, Mary Ellen Fletcher, Barry Greenfield, Greg MacDonald, Peter Spellios

Absent: Tom Oneil,

Guest: Michael McClung

Review of minutes from 03/29/18, 04/26/18 and 08/28/18 meeting

Motion to approve minutes by MF; second by BG; unanimous

Open Issues:

Discuss new member - PS to see about BOS appointment

MF nominated Barry Greenfield to be the new Chairperson of Article 6; second by SW; unanimous. SW will continue to be the secretary.

Discuss opportunity analysis as presented by each member (see Appendix to Minutes)

- BG Utility and Broadband analysis – he spoke w Marblehead Light Co, they are willing to have discussion but we need to explore more first. M’head infrastructure would have to be upgraded to accommodate increased service. More communities running their own municipal broadband or using 3rd party broadband providers. Significant upfront expenses for both but future cost savings. Requires further investigation.
- SW Health Department analysis – our current budget is only 110K so cross jurisdictional sharing will have minimal cost savings but benefits might include increased level of service and greater range of services. There are opportunities to be explored such as shared grant writer, shared PH nurse, shared inspectional services. Is there any cost savings from moving Solid Waste from DPH? Is there an opportunity to consolidate/share w/school. We already have existing sharing agreements with other communities. PS shared 2019 DPH goals.
- GM Assessment analysis – small dept, Board and Asst Assessor, use Patriot Properties – biggest opportunity cost may be in looking at lost revenue. PS suggests discussing with Town Administrator and learning about assessment changes in Lynn.
- MF Purchasing analysis – need more info, need to review 5yr CIC plan, stressed the importance of putting together small working group to evaluate different purchases, MM added services as well as ‘thing; technology contracts and services were discussed. Members agreed about the need to build a better process to better vet purchases pre CIC/TM approval
- MM technology analysis – discussed/questioned town technology leadership, contracting vs in-house, small tech budget, purchasing, security, lack of technology plan. MF brought up idea of Tech Com to advise, BG suggested further investigation and will introduce to MF to Brookline CIO. Need more info and tech analysis.

- MF Outsourcing facilities analysis- listed neighboring communities that outsource town and/or school facilities management, ie Lexington. Spoke with a few outsourcing companies, cost savings could be 1 FTE but need to look at needs. MM added controls are important but also envelope and other systems. Need to identify what providers need to know to cost out facilities management plan. Need to look at spreadsheets Mike Scola developed for town and school buildings. BG to introduce MF to additional outsourcing co. MF would like to speak with DPW and school dept for more info
- TO was absent and Solid Waste analysis was not presented.

Action Items:

- Peter Spellios to follow up with BOS appointment
- All members to meet with Town Administrator before next meeting to get input on specific area of analysis

Next meeting date: November, 1, 2018

Motion to adjourn by BG; second by SW; unanimous, adjourned at 8:45

Minutes submitted by Suzanne Wright

Attachments: 4 opportunity analyses

APPROVED 11/1/18

APPENDIX

Article 6 Committee - Opportunity Analysis

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Description: Management of all Town Facilities, outsource or in house.

Operating Budget/Actuals:

FTE-

Benefits-

Operating expenses

Contracts

Capital Investment:

Control Panels etc.

Historic:

Information: Facility management is multi-faceted with needs ranging from HVAC, overall building assessment, contract management, maintenance and repair. Multiple companies in the New England area offer facility management. Please see attached list.

Future Analysis: There is a need to analyze the actual needs/requirements of community buildings and see if outsourcing should be an option.

Companies:

EMCOR---emcorfacilities.com

Able—ableserve.com 800-461-9033

UG2—Ug2 617-279-8100

C&W—cwservices.com 888-751-9100

JLL- jll.com

Benefits: Cost savings on FTE including but not limited to retirement, health, vacation etc. Improved efficiencies.

Risk: Expense.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Description

The primary function of the health department is to prevent/monitor disease, provide health education, enforce public health codes and regulations, in Swampscott our Health Department manages the Town's solid waste contracts as well. Over the years there has been an increase in the expectations and demands in essential public health services yet decrease or level funding for these services. The Health Dept is less than 2% of the general budget.



The 10 Essential Public Health Services

TOWN Operating Budget/Actuals

FY19: \$110,425 (\$94,750 personnel - director and nurse and \$15,675 expenses)

FY18: \$160,233 (\$144,793 personnel – director, clerical & nurse and \$15,440 expenses)

FY17: \$163,527 (\$152,378 personnel – director, clerical & nurse and \$11,149 expenses)

FYI – SCHOOL FY19 Nursing Budget ~ \$375K (\$350K personnel + \$24K stipends and expenses)

The demands of school nurses and public health nurses are very different; however there may be some opportunities to share personnel for some services.

Capital Investment

None

Considerations

Shared grant writer

Regionalize public health nurse or share with school

Regionalize inspectional services

Remove solid waste contracts from public health to public works

Cross-community comparison

Marblehead (POP 20,000): \$184 (\$163K Personnel) also \$60K Mental health contractual services

Lynnfield (POP12,800): \$128 (\$88K personnel)

Salem (POP 43,000): \$554

Benefits

- delivery increased level of service and greater range of services,
- variety of different and flexible cross-jurisdictional sharing arrangements

Tighter integration



- Regionalization of health departments, such as through the consolidation of two or more health departments (Already - *NEMLAC Regionalization of emergency preparedness*)
- Sharing staff or programs/functions between two or more health departments, such as an epidemiologist or sanitarian that supports multiple health department jurisdictions or shared mental health program (Already share *Animal Control Officer with Marblehead*)
- Sharing defined services, such inspection services, flu clinics (Already share *Hazardous Waste Day w Mhead*)
- Collaborative assessment and planning processes that include two or more health departments and leads to shared priorities; examples might include regional preparedness plans, cross-border plans, or community health improvement plans (Already shared *development of Opioid Harm Reduction Resource pamphlet*)

Looser integration

Risks

Further analysis

Determining community cost for shared service

Helpful Resources:

Center for Sharing Public Health Services - <https://phsharing.org/>

CDC - cross jurisdictional sharing - <https://www.cdc.gov/stltpublichealth/cjs/index.html>

Article 6 Committee - Opportunity Analysis

TECHNOLOGY

Description

Town and school-wide technology functions: software/hardware; capital/operating; including but not limited to: networking, individual workstations, web properties, applications, disaster recovery, archiving & records retention, communications, and

Operating Budget/Actuals

FY19: \$544,650 Schools: \$389,071

FY18: \$588,426 (no phones?) Schools: \$339,784

FY17: \$367,998 (no phones?) Schools: \$386,742

Capital Investment

FY19: \$60,000 Schools: \$223,000

FY18: \$27,000

FY17: \$74,600 Schools: \$110,000

Benefits

Reduced cost, optimized technology stack, redundant support

Risks

Current outsourcing contract terms, joint-purchasing reduces options,

Cross-community comparison

Salem: \$1,855,255 Schools: \$389,601

Lynn: \$863,475 Schools: \$1,786,069

Peabody: \$434,219 Schools: \$847,438

Further analysis

What is the term of the existing contract?

What hidden costs are not captured?

What licensing or other expenses are set by contract?

Are comparison community expenses apples-to-apples?

Article 6 Committee – Opportunity analysis

ASSESSMENT

Description

Town, residential, and commercial property assessment along with vehicle (car, boat, etc.) valuations. Property assessment is completed every three years, physical assessment conducted every (?) years. Vehicle assessment annual as needed

Operating Budget/Actuals

Unknown (could not determine from town budget)

Capital Investment

Unknown, but likely predominately IT system for record keeping, transportation for physical assessments, current contact for physical assessments

Benefits

Potential reduced cost, ability to transfer liability (?), redundancy if relying on town personnel

Risks

Current outsourcing contract terms (physical assessments), potentially few external options, job sharing with other towns reduces options

Cross-community comparison

TBD

Further analysis

Existing contracts
Current personal
Liability
Community comparison
Other town partners

Questions

- Recall a letter saying physical assessments being conducted this year (?).
- What role does the Board of Assessors play? Appropriate to speak with them?
- John Speidel – Assistant Assessor
 - Only assessor for whole town?
 - Is main assessor spot vacant? (employment link not working)
- Assessment beyond properties, how big of a factor?
- Property Assessment Salary – Looks to be \$65K in Mass, range of around \$45K to \$85K based on multiple factors
- Middlesex appraisal - \$400 per house (\$1M?) – That's pure residential
- Was not able to locate potential outsource other than <http://www.patriotproperties.com/>
 - Are we contracted with them for value determination or are they only using publicly available data?