

**Municipal Building Working Group
Tuesday December 23, 2014
Steele Block – 2nd Floor Conference Room**

Present: A. Nelson, B. DeLaBruere, B. Farr, M. Kasamatsu, C. Viens, C. Palermo, T. Wood, W. Shepeluk, and C. Lawrence.

The meeting commenced at 1:00pm.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the draft budget for the new municipal complex. C. Viens reviewed the details of the budget since the last meeting and deferred to VIA and ReArch to review changes. B. DeLaBruere worked with A. Nelson and A. Murray and distributed a revised estimate and a memo on value engineering suggestions.

The goal was to first reduce costs for the building site versus the building. B. DeLaBruere reviewed the value engineering suggestions and adjusted the previous estimate based on that list. The budget is now \$169,291 over budget versus \$483,105 on the last estimate. Some items have been shifted to owner's costs.

B. Farr is keeping a spreadsheet of the entire budget and would like to work with VIA and ReArch to bring it up to date. There has been some grant funding received which will help close the gap.

C. Palermo asked if savings could occur when the project is put out to bid. B. DeLaBruere responded that some items may come under budget but other trades may go over. It also depends on the market at the time the project is put out to bid. A. Nelson stated that this budget estimate reflects their best estimate including the market.

The radon option was discussed. Option #4 is in the budget as this is the least expensive option. A. Nelson stated that this option will meet standards and protect the inhabitants of the building. Some headroom will be lost, and there will be some owner's costs on option #4 for consultant testing.

Three parking spaces were removed from the prior estimate. This may require an amended permit from the DRB. C. Viens asked about the vault specifications. T. Wood asked about the heating and ventilations systems. A. Nelson gave an explanation of the system that is included in the budget and stated that the baseboards can be downgraded to a lesser quality.

C. Palermo asked about the \$35,000 reduction in lighting. B. DeLaBruere responded that the reduction was a savings on fixtures.

B. Farr asked about the commissioning of building systems line item. Efficiency Vermont requires that systems be inspected and will pay for ½ of the cost. The remainder is part of the owner's budget.

The alternates and options were reviewed:

1. The wood pellet boiler was removed.
2. The option to increase the outside air conditioner was retained.
3. Some claims have been made that geothermal system is more mechanically complicated. Making this decision later will result in design costs and scheduling issues. B. Farr suggested having a conversation between VIA, ReArch and Efficiency Vermont to come to a resolution for the best and most cost effective HVAC system for the municipal complex. W. Shepeluk expressed the desire to make the decision prior to the January 5th Select Board meeting. M. Kasamatsu will confirm the status of a Linthilac grant. If this

grant is not available, there is no point in considering the more expensive geothermal system.

4. Radon option 3 was removed.
5. Excavation and disposal of contaminated soil – this is an owners cost and will hopefully happen next week.
6. Security and CCTV system – approximately \$8,000 of this cost will come from the Historical Society for a system in their area. All doors in the rest of the building will have wiring run for future security considerations.
7. Flagpoles and concrete bases may be paid for from grant monies.
8. Foundation wall insulation – discussion and will keep as an option.
9. Foundation wall and slab insulation – discussion about walkway specifications. Will look at details and bid as an alternate.

M. Kasamatsu met with someone from Vermont Correctional Industries about furniture pricing. She indicated that the benches could be pulled out of the program room to save costs.

A Nelson asked for direction moving forward as there is still \$169,291 that needs to be cut from the budget. The budget cannot include grant money that has not yet been received. C. Viens suggested major areas of savings might include eliminating the community room, cutting parking, removing some concrete walkways and making them gravel, and narrowing the walkways from eight feet to 5 feet.

B. Farr stated that a downtown grant might be available for \$80,000 to be applied to parking, lighting and sidewalks, and that some of these areas can be left flexible. Areas can be identified for last add-ons in case the grant money comes through.

B. Farr would like to look at the budget as a whole, and then parse out some items that may have to happen in the future. The Select Board is looking for a balanced budget on January 5th.

The pending Act 250 response was discussed. A. Nelson recommended against asking for any time extensions. There are no substantial building changes to trigger a new hearing. A school board meeting will be scheduled to make a correction to the deed. The response to the recess order can be submitted by the deadline of December 30th.

B. Farr reported that the local permit has been approved with no appeals.

VIA and ReArch will meet with the Select Board on Monday January 5th to present the budget. The building design group will meet on Thursday January 8th at 2:00pm.

The meeting ended at 2:35pm.