DEPT./BOARD: CAPITAL BUDGET COMMITTEE

DATE: TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2020

TIME: 7:00 PM

PLACE: TOWN HALL, BASEMENT BREAK ROOM

Agenda

1. 7:00 PM to 7:40 PM: Police Department: Capital Budget Request Review

2. 7:40 PM to 8:20 PM: Fire Department: Capital Budget Request Review

3. 8:20 PM: IT Department: Capital Budget Request Review

4. Approval of Draft Minutes from 2/11/20 Capital Budget Committee Meeting

Agenda is Subject to Change

Times Noted for Discussion Items are Subject to Change
Mr. Zabolotny opened the meeting at 7:00 PM. He noted that the Police Department budget requests would be rescheduled to a future meeting. He asked Chief Patterson to update the Capital Budget Committee (CBC) on the results of past Capital Budget requests.

**FIRE DEPARTMENT**

**A. UPDATES ON PAST CAPITAL BUDGET ITEMS**

**1. New Ambulance**

Chief Patterson introduced Assistant Chief Connery to the CBC. Assistant Chief Connery noted that he was a 25-year veteran of the Fire Service. Chief Patterson provided the CBC with an update on several items. He noted a new, custom-designed ambulance. He noted that the ambulances are rotated, so that the newest is always based at Headquarters, with the next newest being based at Station 2, and so on. He noted ambulances typically remain the #1 vehicle for 3 years before being rotated to vehicle #2. The Chief noted that the newest ambulance had been designed to accommodate Advanced Life Support (ALS). He noted that Burlington contracts with Armstrong Ambulance to provide ALS support. He said Burlington was about one month away
2. Update on Past Capital Budget Items: Computer-Aided Dispatch
Chief Patterson said a vendor had not yet been selected for the computer-aided dispatch system. He noted that this was a joint effort of the Police and Fire Departments.

Chair Zabolotny asked if Chief Patterson anticipated adequate funding for this effort. Chief Patterson responded yes; he anticipated sufficient funding in the prior Budget Request.

3. Update on Past Capital Budget Items: Headquarters Security System
Mr. Mercier and Mr. Senesi asked the Chief to comment on the new security system at Fire Headquarters.

Chief Patterson responded the prior request was for a system (cameras, etc.) and software. He said the system works well, and that it controls access to the private areas of the building (i.e. sleeping quarters). He also noted the specialized cameras were installed at Station #2 and can be monitored from Headquarters. Chief Patterson noted that footage from one of the cameras was being used by the State Police in an investigation.

4. Update on Past Capital Budget Items: Fire Station #2
Chief Patterson said the new Station opened in July 2019. He said access is controlled via a fob/card key system. He said the building is performing as expected.

Chair Zabolotny asked about any repairs or contractor fixes. Chief Patterson responded that there have been some items fixed, but they have been minor: Small roof leaks, garage door adjustments, HVAC service. He also noted that the type of door is new to staff, so some of the issues have been with personnel getting used to how it operates. He noted all of these items were within the original budget.

Mr. Kasky asked how many services calls the Department has experienced. Chief Patterson responded approximately 4,600 with 60% being from Headquarters, and 40% from Station #2. He noted most are related to medical conditions. He also noted the training room was an asset in that the Department has brought staff from the Fire Academy to conduct courses in Burlington.

Mr. Senesi asked about the Tower at Station #2, and whether it was being used? Assistant Chief Connelly said yes. It allows staff to train on ladders, to have an area to practice belaying techniques, and standpipe connections. Chief Patterson noted the Station also has enough space to practice Rapid Intervention Team response, including a false wall that can be broken through as part of entry training.

Chief Patterson also noted that now that Burlington has space to conduct more onsite training, including the Tower at Station #2, the Department was hoping to achieve ISO certification level 2. He noted the Department
B. CURRENT BUDGET REQUESTS

1. New Administrative Vehicle
Chair Zabolotny asked Chief Patterson to describe the new (2020) capital requests.

Chief Patterson said the first request was a new Administrative Vehicle. Using the materials distributed to the Capital Budget Committee, he said the new vehicle would replace a 2008 Ford Escape that had significant body corrosion.

Mr. Senesi asked why the Department was replacing the old vehicle with same model, only newer? Mr. Kasky asked why not choose an Explorer?

Chief Patterson noted the vehicles in the Department are “handed down” as they age, and the one that is the focus of this request is now the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Supervisor’s vehicle. He said it had some Fire Service equipment in it, which is described in the quote provided to the CBC, but it does not have the same equipment as is needed on a Chief or Assistant Chief’s vehicle. He also noted it is intended to be brought home by the EMS Supervisor, as this staff person is on 24-hour call. The Chief also noted the price differential between the Escape and Explorer was significant, and the Escape would perform well.

Chair Zabolotny asked for any additional questions or comments on this budget request. Hearing none, he asked for a vote. Mr. Senesi moved to recommend approval of a Capital Budget Request for up to $32,000 for the purpose of purchasing and equipping a new Fire Department Administrative vehicle. Mr. Mercier seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

2. New Radio Box Receiving System
Chief Patterson, using the materials previously provided to the CBC, described the proposed new radio box receiving system. He noted that like many communities, fire alarms had historically been transmitted from a location, by wire, to a receiver in the central Fire Headquarters. In Burlington, this system had been changed in the mid-2000’s from transmission by wire to transmission by radio signal. He said the Budget Request is to replace the two receivers, associated hardware and software at Fire Headquarters. He noted that State regulations require redundancy, hence the two identical systems (primary and backup). He also noted the existing systems are approximately 12 years old. The Chief said that commercial buildings were given a choice when Burlington changed to radio transmission of either installing a radio box alarm or having alarms sent to a Master Box. He said that approximately 100-150 buildings have the radio box alarm, and that most coincide with the larger occupancies in Burlington: Hotels, large companies, or apartment buildings.

Chair Zabolotny commented that if you distribute the projected system cost amongst the 100-150 buildings/companies, the price per covered building is not that great.
Chief Patterson noted the Department was also considering moving the older radio box equipment to Station #2, as it currently receives fire alarms via a link from Headquarters. Said another way, he noted that currently a person at Headquarters must physically call or activate a tone at Station #2 to alert them to a fire call.

Ms. Shakib asked if the quote included insurance and system maintenance. The Chief said it included the equipment, installation and training. He noted the supplier is on the State Bid, so there is a discount for Burlington.

Ms. Saltman asked if other communities use the same system, and if so, how it is functioning? The Chief said that Somerville Fire currently uses the same system, and reports that the Fire Alarm operators like it. For example, he noted the newer software allows buildings to be “zoned” by alarm type. This means that a smoke detector may alarm in a room at Town Hall, and then a heat detector or sprinkler head would send a second alarm. This would allow the dispatchers to know that the same room had smoke and heat, enough to activate a sprinkler head. This would indicate a higher probability of actual fire in a specific area in a building.

Ms. Shakib noted that the current system requires a person to alert Station #2. She also noted that it appears some or all of the older, current equipment would be installed at Station #2. Given its age, she asked if Station #2 would still be alerted verbally, by someone at Headquarters. The Chief responded yes.

Mr. Mercier asked if the new software can be “hacked,” given that the alarms are coming in as radio signals. Chief Patterson suggested it was possible but noted that it has not been the case since the radio system was first installed in the middle-2000s.

Mr. Woods asked if the new system would allow for mass notifications in all the covered buildings. Chief Patterson said it does not have that capability, as even a “reverse 911” as used by the Police Department relies on having a person’s cell number. The Chief noted, however, any Department Head can use the reverse-911 notification system to send out an alert.

Chair Zabolotny asked for any additional questions or comments on this budget request. Hearing none, he asked for a vote. Mr. Kasky moved to recommend approval of a Capital Budget Request for up to $93,000 for the purpose of a new Fire radio box receiving system. Ms. Saltman seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Chief Patterson and Assistant Chief Connelly left the meeting upon completion of the Fire Department Capital Budget items.

C. MIS/IT DEPARTMENT
Chair Zabolotny asked Mr. DeSousa and Mr. Bongiorno to explain the MIS/IT Department Capital Budget requests.
1. 5-Year Network Infrastructure Plan

Mr. DeSousa introduced himself and Mr. Bongiorno. He noted that the Town employed 8 MIS/IT staff to oversee the IT systems, and Email accounts throughout Town buildings and within the schools. He said that MIS (Town) staff manages approximately 300 users and devices in the Town side. The IT department (Schools) manages over 4,500 users, where 3,500 are students and the rest staff members. When you count that this is a one-to-one District school, and staff members who use more than one device, the total count of devices gets close 6,000.

Ms. Shakib noted that there are difficulties with Wi-Fi service in the Highschool. Mr. DeSousa responded that the system is the schools are specialized, in that they comply with State regulations and are equipped with software to screen certain websites for the protection of the students (as minors). The Schools guarantee a connection to the network to all students who have a device that has been provided by the District. The limitation is with personal devices that they bring to the school. He also mentioned that they are working for the next fiscal year, on a BYOD (Bring Your Own Device) network to give access to personal devices. However, such network will have certain Terms of Agreement, the connection time to the network will be limited, and the device and individual will be identifiable in the event of breaking such Agreement.

Mr. Mercier asked how such a system would work, given that the highest form of protection would be device encryption, which would not be the case in a BYOD arrangement. Mr. Bongiorno said the way this will work is that the device will not be "actively manage" by the Schools’ IT Department, contrary to what happens to devices that have been issue by the schools for the students and staff.

Mr. Mercier asked how the system is parceled out to users? Mr. DeSousa said that our network has a feature called QOS (Quality of Service) that controls and manages network resources according to their importance. Voice is being given the highest priority, second is Staff, third are students-assigned devices, and last guest access. Mr. DeSousa also noted that the Town Network is managed separately from the school network.

Mr. DeSousa began the explanation of the first Capital request: The Infrastructure upgrade. He said the request would be parceled out over 5 years, at $300,000 per year. He said that this cycle of upgrades is focused on replacing the central core switches located at the Town that have reached their end of life.

Chair Zabolotny asked if this request was similar in nature to the prior one, although he noted the previous infrastructure upgrade was done over 6 years. Mr. DeSousa said the shorter time frame (by one year) was largely because the prior upgrade was a switch in the telephony systems to Voice Over IP. He said this was a more complex technology change and took an “extra year” to complete. Mr. DeSousa said the current upgrades are more of existing equipment, and that is generally done by industry standard every 5 years. He noted 28 out of the 100 switches were scheduled to be replaced.

Chair Zabolotny noted that switches can cost several thousands of dollars and that the estimates provided by the MIS Department were closer to the middle to lower end of the range. Mr. Mercier said that he works for an IT-related company, and that upgrading the hardware is a necessity with 6,000 + accounts. Mr. DeSousa said the
Mr. Bongiorno said the MIS Department were still evaluating options. He noted each potential vendor was being scrutinized for the features included in the quote, noting that some had submitted pricing without consideration of a critical core upgrade. He noted this reduced the price of the quote but would leave the Town lacking an upgrade to a key system component.

Ms. Shakib asked if support was included in the quotes? Mr. Bongiorno said yes, and it is spread over the 5-year span.

Mr. DeSousa noted that the MIS Department was even reluctant to release the names of the specific security products being considered, as this would give potential hackers one more piece of information to use if they wanted to compromise the system. He said the company they are dealing with, only sells through their “channel-partners,” not directly, and that such vendor is in the State approved list. He also said that when comparing prices in the quote against retail prices, a substantial discount was applied. Mr. Bongiorno also said that anyone could go on the web and compare item by item.

Mr. Klasky said then where is the incentive for a company to submit a bid to the Town? Mr. Bongiorno said that the vendor is on the state bid list, and Mr. DeSousa answered the question about the interest rate for this 5-year term purchase, being zero percent.

Chair Zabolotny agreed with Mr. Bongiorno, noting that the business was one of developing a relationship with a client, be they in the private or public sectors. He said the pricing model is one of a long-term lease on equipment, with the profit center being in the service part of the contract, and the fact that the technology is constantly being upgraded.

Ms. Shakib noted she worked in the healthcare industry and understood the pricing model. In this case, she asked what would happen at the end of 5 years when the IT support ended? Mr. DeSousa noted that the IT system would be re-evaluated, and the equipment and software most in need of upgrading would be scheduled for replacement at that time. Mr. Bongiorno noted that the contract being looked at with the current request would provide support on “relatively old” equipment and software that was not being upgraded. He said in this way, older technology was constantly being tended to.

Mr. Mercier asked if the School Department had its own IT/MIS staff? Mr. DeSousa said the MIS Department oversees both the Town and School equipment and software. Mr. Mercier said the School Department should contribute to the MIS Department’s budget.

Chair Zabolotny noted that the Town had made a conscious change several years ago, to take the IT function out of the school and general Town budgets and create an independent line item. He said this allows the Capital
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Budget Committee, as the proxy for Town Meeting Members in spending reviews to better understand and oversee the type of budget request being made now.

Mr. Bongiorno said that both the School Department and MIS Department have their own IT operating budgets. He also noted the infrastructure is shared throughout the Town.

Mr. Klasky said the issue of IT infrastructure was straight-forward. As such, he moved to recommend approval of a Capital Budget Request for up to $1,500,000 for the purpose of a 5-Year Network Infrastructure Plan, to be utilized at approximately $300,000 per year over the 5-year span. Mr. Senesi seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

2. Enterprise Security Solutions for Network  
Chair Zablotny said the issue of network security was vital, but confusing. He suggested that introducing some of the Network protection capability to Town accounts handling sensitive data (i.e. Social Security numbers) was troublesome, as it involved the vendor being able see parts of the data stream. He was particularly concerned by any software or monitoring capabilities included in the overall safety package as which he referred to as “freeware.”

Mr. DeSousa said the municipal data is physically housed within the Town in its servers. He distributed a handout of 6 items in a “comprehensive security system.” He noted that software monitoring such as Application Security would involve a message being screened by an algorithm which would alert a user that a message included sensitive data. This would generate a message prior to an Email being sent, asking the user to confirm the desire to send the message. Mr. DeSousa noted that the security product, noted as Item #4 in his response to Chair Zablotny’s Email is not free, and is not referred to as such in his response.

Ms. Shakib noted her company handles such data all the time. She asked if the software would quarantine the message before sending it, and encrypt it, or if it would just prompt the sender one last time to confirm the desire the send the message? Mr. DeSousa said it would do the latter.

Chair Zablotny still expressed skepticism in the true effectiveness of such software. Ms. Shakib suggested in response that the types of things listed in the handout are all industry standard. She said the vendor assessment is key to understanding the value of each item and offered to assist the MIS Department in vetting the vendor responses.

Mr. Bongiorno said that Chair Zablotny had a good point; the MIS Department needed to clarify with potential bidders what the “vendor” possessed, and what the Town “possessed” in terms of the data stream. He also noted he used industry reviews to gauge vendor quality but welcomed any assistance Ms. Shakib could provide. He also noted the Town’s MIS Cyber Security Committee was involved in vendor assessment.
Mr. Klasky said he was not comfortable making a recommendation on the Enterprise Security Solution Budget Request. He suggested that the Cyber Security Committee make a report or presentation to the Capital Budget Committee on these issues.

Ms. Shakib said the concepts laid out in the MIS Department’s security plan were on point. She said the deeper issue was the vendor, its reliability, willingness to address concerns, and the reliability of its products.

Mr. DeSousa noted that the MIS Department was looking at six security “modules,” as outlined on the two-sided handout. He noted one vendor was being considered for five of the modules, and a different one for the firewall component. Mr. DeSousa said this was being done based on research that indicated a certain vendor had a better firewall product.

Mr. DeSousa, in response to a question from Chair Zabolotny, said that all the companies look at the data stream to determine if a message constitutes a threat to the system, or if a message from one user is a threat to another user. He noted this was particularly important given the several thousand student accounts. It would allow for better monitoring of potential Cyberbullying.

Mr. Bongiorno that “free” in the context of an overall software or service package meant that it was included as part of a standard “base” package. He used the example of a free software package called “QUAD NINES.” He said this software is designed to block spurious websites. He noted it works in the “background” when loaded onto a device, and as such, the user is not necessarily aware that a site has been blocked. He noted, however, the software being considered by the Town does have a “dashboard” feature that will provide metrics on the sites being blocked.

Chair Zabolotny agreed that it was important for the Capital Budget Committee to understand the cyber security issues in more detail. As such, he polled the Members, asking if the matter could be tabled. This would allow a meeting to be scheduled when the Cyber Security Committee, including the MIS Department staff, could make an informational presentation that CBC members could attend.

The consensus of the Capital Budget Committee was to Table Request #2 concerning Enterprise Security Solution, allowing an informational meeting to be scheduled.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES
Chair Zabolotny said he had made a few corrections to draft February 11, 2020 Minutes. He asked for further corrections. Hearing none, he asked for a motion on the Minutes.

Mr. Senesi moved to approve the draft Minutes of the February 11, 2020 Capital Budget Committee meeting as corrected by the Chair. Mr. Woods seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Adjourn
Mr. Zabolotny asked for any public or other comment, and if there were any further matters to come before the Committee? Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adjourn.
Mr. Mercier moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Kasky seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Minutes Approved, Ernest Zabolotny, Chair

March 2, 2020

Date