

Items adjusted during Design Development based on more information:			
<b>Project Cost from August 16, 2016 summary spread sheet, including 15% contingency for all items except \$20,000 office rent</b>	<b>Estimate from August 16, 2016:</b>	<b>\$1,483,802</b>	<i>Building cost items only to calculate State Permit Application Fee, not including A/E fees or furniture</i>
<b>Adjustments to Scope of Work</b>			
Adjust A/E fee to credit completed Architectural Schematic Design (Already contracted to include larger training room.)	(\$15,140)		
Increase size of training room to seat 41 at training tables. Add 279 sf instead of 240sf originally estimated for this change to get proper shape of room. Cost estimate for additional 240 sf was \$30,000. 279sf, therefore is now estimated to cost \$34,875, using same cost/sf.	\$34,875		\$34,875.00
Add more tables and chairs in larger training room	\$2,500		
Do not relocate Police Shed as it is not necessary with the 31 space parking area planned now.	(\$800)		(\$800.00)
Omit Steel beam, due to new shape of training room. We can now use a bearing wall.	(\$1,910)		(\$1,910.00)
Correct estimate for Sprinkler System to now include apparatus building inadvertently forgotten by cost estimator (always in program)	\$15,464		
Add State Fees to Permitting costs	\$12,000		
Add one window in training room	\$1,737		\$1,737.00
Reduce width of windows in Police rest rooms	(\$1,500)		(\$1,500.00)
Add utility sink in Fire Apparatus workspace at existing plumbing location	\$200		\$200.00
Simplify radio towers down to \$6000 from \$11,000 estimate for estimated savings of \$5000.	(\$5,000)		(\$5,000.00)
Concrete sidewalk to entrance door and apparatus building instead of asphalt	\$2,000		\$2,000.00
Add flag pole with light and footing	\$1,500		\$1,500.00
<i>Amount added to Building Construction cost from original number</i>			\$31,102.00
	<b>Net difference from original estimated cost of August 16,</b>	<b>\$45,926</b>	<b>3.10%</b>
<b>Estimated Project Cost, after Design Development but still carrying full 15% contingency</b>	<b>1,480,000</b>	<b>\$1,529,728</b>	
Bonds voted for Project (\$1,410,000 + \$75,000)=	\$1,485,000		
Original Estimated Project cost without contingency	\$1,305,744		
Adjustments to project cost after design development. Add:	\$45,926		
<b>Updated Estimated Project Cost After Design Development</b>	<b>\$1,351,670</b>		
	<b>Remaining Contingency</b>	<b>\$133,330</b>	128,330

**Miranda Bergmeier**

---

**From:** claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 07, 2017 10:05 PM  
**To:** Miranda Bergmeier; Mary Layton  
**Subject:** correction of March 22, 2017 minutes

Hello,

Upon review of the March 22, 2017 minutes included in the Selectboard packet for the upcoming April 12 meeting, I noticed an apparent error in the minutes.

For #6, the minutes state that I spoke in support of a public round-table for discussion of the selectboard goals.

That is not the case. I spoke to having a meeting of the board to determine SB goals with a trained meeting facilitator- not a public round table.

Claudette

**Miranda Bergmeier**

---

**From:** Jeff Lubell <jefflubell@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 08, 2017 4:12 PM  
**To:** Miranda Bergmeier  
**Cc:** Jeff Goodrich  
**Subject:** Note re Planning Commission Appointments for April 12 meeting

Dear Ms. Bergmeier,

I am writing with regard to an item to be considered by the Selectboard on Wed., April 12. Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the meeting since I have another meeting at that time. I would appreciate if you could pass on my comments to members of the Selectboard.

I understand that Jaci Allen and Steve Thoms have applied to renew their service on the planning commission. Based on my experience working with Jaci and Steve on the commission, I believe they merit reappointment and respectfully urge the Selectboard to accept their applications and renew their membership on the commission.

Both Jaci and Steve have served abbreviated terms and not yet had the opportunity to serve a full term. During their time on the commission, they have been attentive and well prepared and contributed significantly to commission deliberations. They bring different life experiences from the other members of the commission which adds diversity and richness to our discussions. By renewing their terms, they will have an opportunity to apply the knowledge they have gained during their partial terms to help us make progress in updating the town plan and handling other pending work. Their contributions will be particularly helpful in ensuring that we can effectively strengthen our pending proposals in response to public feedback.

Thank you for considering my views.

Best,

Jeff Lubell  
Member, Planning Commission