

TOWN OF WELLESLEY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS



DAVID A. COHEN, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

David A. Cohen

August 4, 2014

To: Owen Dugan, Board of Public Works
Don McCauley, North 40 Steering Committee

Re: DPW Cost Impacts of North 40 Development

In response to inquiries made by the North 40 Steering Committee, the Department of Public Works has developed preliminary estimates for various development scenarios at the North 40 property.

With the exception of leaving the property as conservation land, the various other scenarios result in additional costs of \$187K to \$240K. These amounts represent roughly a 2-3% increase to our total tax impact budget. The table below summarizes the estimated impacts for each scenario and also shows the incidental enterprise fund impact and additional staff anticipated. Our estimates includes personal service costs, expense costs, and ongoing capital costs of maintaining added inventory to our asset infrastructure (for example, 3 miles of road that would need to be repaved every 10 – 14 years).

Scenario	Tax Impact	Water/Sewer Impact	Additional Permanent Staff	Additional Seasonal Staff
Conservation	\$14,000	\$0	0	0
Passive Recreation	\$187,000	\$1,000	0	0
Active Recreation	\$222,000	\$5,000	1	2
100 Homes	\$213,000	\$5,000	0	0
300-400 Housing Units	\$240,000	\$7,000	0	0
School	\$200,000	\$5,000	.5	1

These estimates are based on projected maintenance required to support the infrastructure typical for each development scenario. For example, if 100 homes were to be built, we assume that approximately 3 miles of road, sidewalk and drainage infrastructure would need to be maintained. Maintenance requirements for these activities would include, for example, road repairs, catch basin cleaning, street sweeping, debris cleanup, plowing and hydrant flushing. In comparison, if an active recreation site were created, some portion of the above activities would be required along with field maintenance, mowing, seeding, weeding, grooming, and site amenities maintenance. Similar maintenance requirements would exist to more or less extent for each of the scenarios except for conservation.

If the property were to be left as is, there would be very little maintenance required and we have included a token amount to account for incidental maintenance that is typically required in existing similar areas for parking lots, access roads, and occasional trail maintenance.

We believe that our current water and sewer infrastructure is sufficient to handle the added demand in each scenario. Any costs of pumping additional water would be paid for by the specific users through their water and sewer rates. We have assumed that any initial infrastructure, including water and sewer, would be part of the capital cost or developer cost of any development. We estimate an incremental increase in water and sewer system maintenance and we have also accounted for capital maintenance and replacements due to any new infrastructure installed.

Finally, we expect that additional staff may be needed to handle the maintenance of select potential development. Specifically, active recreation space will require one (1) full time groundskeeper and two (2) additional seasonal staff. The creation of a new school will require one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) of a full time groundskeeper and one (1) additional seasonal employee. We estimate that the maintenance required for the other scenarios could be handled by existing staff. Benefit costs for any additional staff have not been included in this analysis.

We hope this information is helpful to you and the Committee. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Cc: Mike Pakstis, Director of Public Works
David Donohue, Board of Public Works
Paul Criswell, Board of Public Works